

INTERESTING DEBATE.

RECEPTION OF

GOV. ANDREW JOHNSON, of Tennessee, and

EX-GOV. WRIGHT, of Indiana,

AT THE

State Capitol of Pennsylvania.

FULL PROCEEDINGS IN THE SENATE.

HARRISBURG, PA:

GEORGE BERGNER, PRINTER,

TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

1863.

INTERESTING DEBATE.

RECEPTION OF GOV. ANDREW JOHNSON, OF TENNESSEE, AND EX-GOVERNOR WRIGHT, OF INDIANA, AT THE STATE CAPITOL OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FULL PROCEEDINGS IN THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, *March 6, 1863.*

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution, which was twice read :

WHEREAS, Governor Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, a brave and loyal man, whose devotion to the Union is fully attested by his sacrifices and efforts in the cause of his country, and Ex-Governor Joseph A. Wright, a distinguished and patriotic citizen of the State of Indiana, are about to visit Harrisburg and propose to address the people on the great questions now agitating the public mind and which are of so much moment to the stability of the General Government ; therefore.

Resolved That Governor Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, and Ex-Governor Joseph A. Wright, of Indiana, be and they are hereby tendered the use of the hall of the Senate this afternoon for the purpose of addressing their fellow-citizens of Pennsylvania.

The question before the Senate being on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CLYMER called the yeas and nays.

Mr. LOWRY. I should be sorry indeed to let it go forth to the country that the Senate of Pennsylvania had refused its hall and closed its heart to that great, glorious and good man Andrew Johnson.

The House of Representatives within the last hour, has by Democratic votes declared that the voice of that loyal man, whose family and loyal neighbors have been hunted like wild beasts, shall not be heard. Sir, when that vote was cast I believe, "there was silence in Heaven" for more than "half an hour." That vote strikes the loyal men of Pennsylvania in the face, and will quicken the blood of indignation in their hearts.

It will satisfy the people of this Commonwealth that as I have a hundred times said, if this Senate and the Governor of the State were in sympathy with the House of Representatives, we would be bound to the car of slavery and go over manacled to Jeff Davis within forty-eight hours. This I believe to be truth

—God's own truth the declarations and pretensions of Senators to the contrary notwithstanding. Every day, and every hour, every vote and every act convinces me more of it.

The vote just given in the other branch of the Legislature, will startle loyal Pennsylvania like a bell in the night—yes, sir, like a bell in the night!

Governor Andrew Johnson a patriot who has suffered persecution and endured untold trials for his country—passing through our capital at such a time, and on such a mission, refused the hall of our Representatives! The voice of such a patriot stifled in Pennsylvania!

I will not enlarge upon the painful subject. I have too much feeling to speak. True men of the Senate, I implore you as you love your God, put your heel upon and subdue this new envenomed antic of the copperheads.

Mr. LAMBERTON. I offer the following amendment to the resolution:—to add to the resolution the words: "and that the use of the hall of the Senate be likewise extended to Major General George B. M'Clellan, in which to receive the hosts of his admiring friends of this, his native State; and that the Senate invite him to visit the State Capital for that purpose."

Mr. LOWRY. I have but a single word to say, and I would not say it had not the name of George B. M'Clellan been introduced here at this time. The name of George B. M'Clellan and Andrew Johnson will go down to future generations but those two men will not be seen in future time, as being arm in arm or breast to breast together. They will go down in history upon the same page. Of one of them no eulogy is needed. God and history are just. With reference to General M'Clellan, I have only to say that the strongest and highest mark of his character in Time's holy history will be that with the most finely

equipped, best fed, and the bravest army of men that ever stood on the earth one hundred and twenty thousand strong he stood for eight long months in the presence of an enemy of forty thousand men with wooden guns. I hope that the amendment will be voted down. It comes from unclean hands.

Mr. WHITE. Fairness and candor compel me to say a word in justification of the resolution I have offered, and of the reasons which prompted it. At the outset, I may say, I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Clarion. In so doing, I do not intimate hostility to General McClellan.

Mr. RIDGWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. It is that the amendment of the Senator from Clarion is out of order, pending a motion to suspend the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Senator from Philadelphia is mistaken. The question is not upon the suspension of any rule.

Mr. WHITE, (continuing.) But, sir, I look upon the amendment as an attempt at this time to do, by indirection, that which, by direction, the gentlemen on the other side of this chamber cannot do—an effort to defeat or embarrass the original proposition. With Gen. McClellan's character as a soldier or a patriot, we have now and here no concern. His history is before the country. To eulogize or censure his public career, is not now my purpose. The thrusting of his name before us at this time, I regard as an artifice to assist opposition to the original resolution. When the same state of facts exist with regard to General McClellan as now exist in reference to Governor Johnson, the question will be different. When I hear that General McClellan is on his way to the capital of our State, and is desirous of addressing our people in behalf of the Union and the country, I may vote for a resolution of the character proposed by the Senator from Clarion. But how stand the parties before us? The public prints of the day inform us that Governor Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, during the past week, visited the capital of the State of Indiana. The Senator from Berks may make if he chooses, the technical objection that Governor Johnson is not the Governor of Tennessee and not entitled to courtesy as such; I care not for this, sir, and I will not stop here to argue his constitutional right to the position. Sufficient for me now, that not many years since, he was elected by the people of Tennessee as their Governor and acted as such. I care not for the vanity of title, it is enough for me to know it is Andrew Johnson, with his glorious history we propose to honor. We know further, that at Indianapolis, the hospitalities of the State were extended to him, and that he addressed the people. We are further informed that when he came to Columbus, the hospitalities of the State of Ohio were tendered

him. We also know that when he spoke to the people, his voice was raised only for the cause of the Union. Knowing these facts, I, as a member of the Senate of Pennsylvania, felt our great State owed it to the character of Andrew Johnson to offer him our hospitalities. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who proposed the meeting of the members of the Legislature, irrespective of party, last evening in this chamber, for the purpose of extending to the distinguished gentleman named in the original resolution, an invitation to address the citizens of Pennsylvania and giving them the use of the hall of the House of Representatives. A committee was appointed for the purpose of arranging the preliminaries. The committee was composed of gentlemen of both political parties. It was not designed by the projectors of this movement to give it, in any way, a partisan character, and our friends on the other side of this chamber were so assured. I had no idea this would be made a party question, or that there would be any difficulty in the matter, until a few moments ago I was informed of the very singular action on the part of the House of Representatives, or the majority party there, in refusing the privilege we propose to extend here. Mr. Speaker, is there any propriety in the refusal of the Legislature to grant the use of either hall under the circumstances? It is not designed as a partizan movement and cannot by any fair means be so construed. Andrew Johnson is not to-day identified with any political party to my knowledge, except it be the party which is devoted to the preservation of the Union and Constitution. If our friends on the other side charge this as an attempt of the party devoted to the perpetuation of the Union to strengthen its power, be it so. If they stand ready to resist any effort to strengthen the arm of the Government, I am willing the record shall so speak. Two years ago Andrew Johnson was a Senator of the United States from Tennessee, elected by Democratic votes.

Mr. LAMBERTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question before the Senate is upon the amendment offered by myself, and not upon the original resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware that that is the question, and would prefer that the Senator from Indiana would speak to the question. But the Chair presumes that with the consent of the Senate the whole subject may be discussed at this time as well as at any other.

Mr. WHITE, (continuing.) The Speaker will observe that to some extent, I am necessarily compelled to discuss the character of the original resolution, but I do not wish to do so at any length.

When interrupted I was remarking Andrew

Johnson was a Senator from Tennessee at the inception of this rebellion, during the last few months of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. His counsel and his voice were ever against secession. His efforts were earnest and vigorous against treason and the traitors. Had his policy to punish treason upon its first demonstration been pursued by this late administration much of the suffering and distress of to-day might have been averted. Never once has he faltered in his fealty to the Union. When treason was rampant in the Senate—when one by one his associates were yielding to the rebellious spirit of their people, he remained firm and true to the country—true to our great Constitution—true to the history of our fathers.

—“He faithful
Among the faithless found.”

But, sir, he was no silent spectator of the scenes of treason around him. His voice was ever ready and eloquent against the traitor. His loyalty was never conditional. In the madness of the hour that hurled his neighboring States into the maelstrom of secession, for the honor, the integrity, the unity of the nation, he was found a fearless champion. Amid the darkness which hung like a pall over the country at the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, Andrew Johnson was a shining light to the timid and the doubtful. In the spring of 1861 he returned to the State he had served so well—his loved Tennessee. He found the mad heel of the traitor tyrant upon the neck of loyalty there. The hellish conspiracy was consummate. Rebellion was crazy and every where around him. “No fear could awe him.” Insult was heaped upon him—personal violence awaited him—his life was threatened—he was spit upon, and all this because he loved the country of Washington.

“The head and front of his offending
Hath this extent, no more.”

Mr. Speaker, this was not all he suffered. The wife of his bosom, with her children, was driven to the street and subjected to the jibes and taunts of an infuriated multitude. His worldly possessions were stolen, confiscated from him, if you please, to aid this damnable rebellion. Gracious Heaven! can it be, opposition will be made to hear such a man for our cause in good old Pennsylvania? Why is this made a party question? Are our Democratic friends afraid of loyal truth and arguments? Are they so devoted to partizan twaddle as not to be able to rise above the politician, and be, for a little while, at least, the patriot? “Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.” Democrats! will the lovers of truth and patriotism anywhere endorse this act of to-day? Think of it! The friends of the Union in the Legislature of

Pennsylvania propose to do honor to a loyal and lion-hearted man, and in honoring him to honor themselves. Yet there is a party within this hall, who throw themselves in the way and attempt by trick and artifice to defeat our laudable purpose. We want the advocates of the Union from the North and South to be heard, and are determined it shall be done. We want Andrew Johnson to sow here the good seed of loyal sentiment, that it may spread and blossom and ripen into harvests of patriotism all over the Commonwealth. To this festival, we invite not Democrats—not Republicans, but citizens of Pennsylvania, that we may all reason together as brethren in a common cause.

Mr. Speaker, how is it with the other gentleman named in the original resolution. He is not, sir, I believe the representative of any political party, save that which goes for the Union. Heretofore he has acted with the Democratic party. Some years since he was elected by that party as Governor of Indiana.

By Mr. Buchanan's administration he was appointed Minister to Prussia. When he returned, after Mr. Lincoln had appointed his successor, he found the country in its present turbulent condition. When Jesse D. Bright was expelled from the Senate of the United States for treasonable practices, Gov. Wright was appointed to fill the vacancy; more lately the Legislature of Indiana elected another gentleman. I understand Gov. Wright is now identified with no political party in the country. He knows but one interest—he has but one feeling—the perpetuation of the old Union. He visits here to utter words of patriotism—to strengthen the power of the Government, and aid in crushing this hell-born rebellion.

These are the men we wish to hear, and for such a purpose they are to be heard. I am now, sir, and always have been opposed to hero-worship. I would never elevate the man above the principle, and I do not propose to do so today. I submit when we honor these men we honor the loyalty of the land—we honor freedom of speech—we honor self-sacrificing patriotism. I believe, sir, the people of my State are hungry for good, wholesome, loyal nourishment, and they ought to have it. The activity, the life of the nation will be aided thereby. The Senator from Berks (Mr. CLYMER) may say he can find with his constituents a satisfactory reason for refusing an audience to these eloquent, Union-loving men, in the Capital of Pennsylvania. I trust he may be mistaken. I am certain, sir, I could not find endorsement with my constituents were I to pursue a similar course. I represent a people who are devoted in their loyalty, and are always anxious to do honor to loyal men. I do not think the Senator from Berks can find a satisfactory reason for his course in the great heart of the people of the Commonwealth. In no way do

we propose to procrastinate public business—no attempt is made to interfere with the usual course of legislation; but when we have adjourned for to-day, we ask the use of our hall to be given these faithful eloquent men—men who know no party—who are willing to co-operate with no party but the party which goes for one country and one Constitution. Would to Heaven these men could speak upon the shores of Lake Erie and be heard upon the banks of the Delaware that the good people of our State everywhere could hear them. I would that the constituents of the Senator from Berks could hear them. Mr. Speaker, now-a-days Democratic orators, grow hoarse in their praise of free speech. Why not attest sincerity of profession by acts to-day? Is it true, with such men as Johnson our Democratic friends can have no intercourse? Can they not with such men keep any profitable society? It seems too strange, but true. Suppose, for a moment, the scene of this occasion to be changed to Charleston, the hot bed of treason. The courtesy of a public reception is there offered some heroic devoted defender of the old flag. Would it be granted! Who would vote for it? Certainly not those who were opposed to the old Union. Clearly no one who was aiding the Richmond dynasty in its efforts to defeat "*Yankees and Northern Abolitionists*." No, sir, no audience would be given in Charleston to Andrew Johnson. The barking hounds of treason would be following him with barbarous cruelty. The gibbet or the bowie-knife would be his reward there. Would our friends on the other side find such society more profitable than the intercourse they now so much deprecate? Their conduct to-day leaves no difficult answer. I grant you, the gentlemen we propose to address us will have no honeyed words for treason. They will not be modest to brand as traitor any man who seeks to divide the American people or steal American territory; and the sneaking traitor at the North, who seeks to divide the north that the South may conquer, will receive no flattering compliments at their hands. I trust, Democrats, you will see "whither you are drifting," and will repent of your conduct. Lift yourselves above party trammels, and plant yourselves upon the elevation of patriotism. Let us unite to maintain the honor and uphold the dignity of the Government and not hawk them in the marts of rebellion. Why this bickering and this strife? Northern men cannot divide on the *great question*. The only path of safety for us and our children is the path of war. Yet there are those among us, aye! high in the councils of the people, who cry peace to sicken and unnerve our energies and our enterprise, and pluck victory from our grasp. Some there are, I trust not many, who would link our fortunes with these rebels—men who would

sooner become tools of a tyranny, of which the southern confederacy is the gloomiest type the world ever saw, than rest citizens of a great republic. While every good patriot prays to-day for the success of the great struggle in which this country has been plunged, the juggling friends of treason by their hellish machinations against the Government would drag us into the whirlpool of domestic conflict.

There are those who are continually croaking about the usurpations of the administration and the impossibility of federal triumph. Such men are kindling a fire to consume their own dwellings. They divide the loyal sentiment of the country and stimulate the hopes of our enemies. The reprobation of all Union-loving men should follow such conduct. The patriot at home has a great work to do as well as the soldier in the field—while one routs the rebel in the field, the other must rout the rebel at home. Good men everywhere must put down treason in whatever shape they find it; they must resolve the serpent shall not spread its slimy coils further over this fair heritage of freedom. Those who pusillanimously embrace the protection of the Government in their persons and estates and secretly attempt its overthrow, must be made fully to comprehend that either their allegiance or support shall be given that Government, or they shall share no privileges it confers. It is high time truths like these were proclaimed giving treason, its true definition, so that the penalties of so great a crime may be meted out without regard to rank or station. In this great war for the life of the nation, the supremacy of the Government must be asserted and maintained. If we are earnest in this great struggle, let us be positive in our great work. Pursue no timid policy. The ark of safety is our unity—unity of action will be much advanced by spreading loyal sentiments. Let us have them, as the Pharisee did his praying, "on the corners of the streets, and the tops of the houses." Educate public sentiment everywhere up to the proper standard. Then we will have Union—no north, no south, no east, no west, but our whole country. Then will there be peace, a long and enduring peace.

"The good ship Union's voyage o'er,
At anchor safe she swings,
And loud and clear with cheer on cheer,
Her joyous welcome rings:
Hurrah! hurrah! it shakes the wave,
It thunders on the shore;
One flag, one land, one heart, one hand,
One nation, evermore!

Mr. PENNY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WHITE] in what he has said upon this question remarked that he was sorry the question had taken a party turn. In one sense of the

word, I too am sorry that it has taken a party turn. I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who in the contest in which the country is now engaged wish to recognize no parties but two: the party in favor of the Government and the party against it. I think that this is the only line of party division that ought to be made in the country now. If it please Senators now to draw the lines there and let the country know to which party they belong on that division, I shall not regret the issue made here. Heretofore I have been glad to know and believe that many, at least, of the Democratic party, as it is called, were supporters of the Government, that they were acting with the friends of the Government and the country. I hope that it is so still. But I confess that when a man belonging to that organization before the troubles of the country, began a man rising from humble life in his own State to the high position of its Chief Executive, from that passing to an important position in the councils of the national Government—a man who has been found true to the interests of his country everywhere—a man whose abilities are respected—a man who has devoted all his life and energy from the commencement of this struggle to the support of the Government, visits our State, and his friends ask that he may be heard in this hall, not, sir, to decry the Government, but in support of it, that he may be heard patriotically, to add his mite of influence to uphold it and give it energy and strength—I say when that simple request is opposed by any party, it looks to me very much as if that party was arraying itself against those who were for the support of this Government.

Why, Mr. Speaker, what is the position of affairs? what is the question now presented to the Senate of Pennsylvania? Every man looks out upon the dark horizon around him; every man knows that the Government of the country is taxed to its utmost and is straining every nerve almost to the breaking, in its contest with the giant rebellion that is grappling with it in every part; and every man who has a patriotic sentiment within his breast must feel that even the least support to that Government, whether it be by tongue, voice or pen, ought to be given here, ought to be given everywhere, ought to be given constantly and always until the fight is over. Now, the simple proposition is, that the Senate of Pennsylvania, irrespective of party, claiming only to be the party that sustains the Government, composed of Republicans, Democrats and Union men, simply ask one of the strong men of the Union to stand in their halls and proclaim his ideas of the true method of supporting the Government and inspiring the patriotism of the country in that support, that he shall have the simple privilege of standing upon the floor of the Senate of the old Key-

stone State to advocate the cause of the country against the rebellion. And we find that there is an array made and a party cry raised against granting that poor boon. What does it mean? Does any man dare to say that if Andrew Johnson was admitted to this floor, he would talk treason or say aught against the country? Does any man charge him with want of fealty to the Government? Does any man charge that his voice when heard in Pennsylvania will do harm? Why then must it be stifled? Why, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of treason, in the midst of rebellion, on his own native soil, he has carried the banner of the Government where few dare go. He has been the soul, the support and the stay of the gallant men of his own State who have resisted unto blood and unto death in defence of their beloved Government. And yet you will not hear him speak! Shall it go out upon the wings of the telegraph everywhere that Andrew Johnson cannot speak in the Pennsylvania Senate?—Why, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if such words should thrill through the country, the people would tremble for the safety of the State of Pennsylvania itself. It would not be strange if Andrew Johnson was asking the use of the hall of the Senate of South Carolina, that the same vote which gentlemen talk about giving here should be given there; he would be excluded there because he would rebuke treason, and traitors have the power there, but why should he be excluded here? If gentlemen put themselves upon that issue, if they say that in the halls of this Legislature, in the halls of Pennsylvania's Capitol, with the freemen of the State anxiously looking for the final triumph of the General Government, no plea shall be made in its behalf by any Democrat who dares to endorse the present Administration, let that be the issue. The Senator from Berks says that he will find a support in the voice of his constituents. I doubt it. I doubt whether there is a constituency in this State anywhere, understanding the question before the Senate, who would for one moment endorse the action which the gentleman proposed here.

Mr. Speaker, the other gentleman embraced in this resolution, was the successor of Jesse D. Bright in the Senate of the United States. About one year ago, upon the discussion of a resolution in this Senate referring to the expulsion of that disloyal Senator, I remarked that I wanted to know who were the friends of the Government, and who were against it, and that I thought there could be but two parties. It is singular that a question should be raised here now in reference to his successor which must again define these parties. Jesse D. Bright was expelled from the Senate of the United States. The Senate of Pennsylvania endorsed that action, but certain

Senators here voted against that endorsement. Now comes up the question again. In the seat of that traitor expelled a patriotic man is placed. He is not a Republican and not obnoxious to party objection, and he serves well and patriotically. He now visits this great State, and his friends ask for him that he shall have accorded to him the privilege of speaking his patriotic sentiments upon the floor of this Senate. A patriotic man who, by the appointment of the Executive, has taken the seat of the traitor, comes here and asks to be heard; and I suppose we will have the same party that voted against the expulsion of the traitor voting against allowing the patriot to be heard. That makes the issue doubly marked; and if the line is to be drawn there, I thank God that the issue has come in so plain a form. I repeat it, let that be the issue that you will not hear the patriotic men of the country speak in your halls, that you will shut their mouths that the people may not hear them, and I am willing to meet it.

Mr. BOUND. I confess that I am astonished—aye, pained—at the position of gentlemen on the other side of the chamber in regard to a resolution of this kind. I confess that I little expected to hear gentlemen who have made the very air resound with yells in favor of the freedom of speech come here and refuse to a true, loyal and earnest patriot, an opportunity to utter loyal sentiments in the halls of the Pennsylvania Legislature. I confess that I was surprised to find men who weep crocodile tears over alleged violations of the freedom of speech and of the press, refusing to men of national reputation, men who have carved their names on the highest scroll of American fame, an opportunity to utter their loyal sentiments here, in the capitol of Pennsylvania. Sir, I thank them that they have made this issue. I thank them that they are now standing upon the same platform which their miserable, libellous and stipendiary press has been making for the last two years. I thank them, although I am sorry when I think of my country, that they are willing to take this responsibility and shoulder the aspersions, the lies and falsehoods that have been uttered and propagated by a libellous press against the true and loyal men of this country. It is true that this is making an issue against the most loyal and patriotic men in the land—men who recognize but one responsibility devolving upon them in this terrible struggle for the life of a great nation, and that is unswerving fidelity to the cause of liberty and heart-felt devotion to the preservation of the Union. For men laying claim to even a qualified loyalty, this is a fearful issue to make—but once tendered by our opponents, there is no alternative left for patriots. It must be accepted, Senators, and here and now is the time and place to

accept it. It is not a question of party, but of country. A blow aimed at these men strikes the very heart of the Republic, and thrills the soul of every true patriot with horror. Strike down these brave defenders of the Republic and you destroy, so far as you are able, all incentives to deeds of noble daring—you crush the patriot and encourage traitors.

Sir, I can appreciate the bravery of these misguided men who go forth to fight the battles of the rebellion, for, bad as their cause is, they at least attest their devotion to it at the hazard of their lives. And for our own brave defenders of the Union, language is too weak and eloquence too feeble to herald their praises in befitting terms. But, for the miserable jackals of party in ranks of our opponents, who remain behind to pick up the few paltry crumbs which patriotism in its eagerness to save the nation has left behind, I have the most unutterable contempt. Little creatures who amidst a nation's death agonies, seize upon every misfortune to our arms with fiendish exultation, and use every pretext to cripple, embarrass and destroy the Government, are only deserving of scorn and execration!

Look at the history of this rebellion. Trace it, if you please, from its inception, and you may then not be surprised that an attempt is here made to prevent two distinguished men, patriots and loyal men peradventure, to utter true and burning words of eloquence, as I know they will utter, in behalf of this Government that traitors are doing their utmost to destroy.

Sir, at the outbreak of this rebellion a singular spectacle was presented to the world. A certain number of States of this Union saw proper, without any cause under heaven, to endeavor to break up and destroy this beautiful and glorious fabric erected at such a cost of blood and treasure by your sires of the revolution. They banded together their armies, marshalled their hosts and blew the blast of war. A few true and loyal men in the south stood by the old Government and the constellated flag of freedom around which so many holy memories cluster, and they determined to stand, to the last, by the Government which your forefathers founded. Sir, they deserve the thanks of the nation and they will receive them, not alone in history, for the prayers of the people of our own day go up everywhere in behalf of those brave and loyal men of the south who are sacrificing the comforts of home and everything that can make life dear to man, who are willing to surrender life and kindred for the sake of that Government and Union they have loved and cherished above all else. Such men will be enshrined in the hearts of generations yet unborn when the miserable dogs who are now barking at

them are consigned to eternal oblivion. Sir, you are fast making history, not only for the present, but for all future time. Each patriot is called upon to come up and take his stand in the ranks of patriots; each friend of his country is called upon to sustain the Government and to do it right loyally and with all his might.

Mr. Speaker, you had at the outbreak of this rebellion, a singular spectacle presented. Now, I do not wish to charge that all Democrats are disloyal. Thank God I know many of them who are not. I know many of them who joined hands with me in endeavoring to strengthen and uphold the Government as it was transmitted to us, and in seeking to encourage the enlistment of volunteers, and in many other ways doing all in their power to sustain the Government. But the singular fact is presented to us that almost every Democratic Governor in the Southern States of the Union, when this rebellion broke out, is now a traitor in arms against the Government, that almost every Democratic Senator in the Senate Chamber of the United States is now a rebel in arms against the Government, that almost every Democratic member of Congress from the same section, at the breaking out of the rebellion is now a rebel in arms against the Government. Sir, you may think that these matters are of no moment: you may think that party voice means nothing. But I would remind you that party attachments and party sympathies are strong; they will swerve good men from the path of duty, of rectitude and of patriotism, and teach them insensibly, as it were, to forget their country and her terrible necessities, while toppling to its fall. What a spectacle is that! Now, then, look at the other side of the picture and tell me if it is not a singular fact that the few true, earnest and loyal men, who through the blood and fire of the Southern rebellion, have stood fast by the Constitution and the Union, (and Andrew Johnson one among the number,) are hawked at and spat upon by the press of that party and denounced in the most infamous language. It is a singular fact that Generals Butler, Dix and Hunter, Halleck, Holt and Stanton, all Democrats heretofore, and who have remained true and loyal to the Government, who are now giving it their assistance, and who have been and are now sustaining it by their mighty energies, should be hawked at and denounced by the press of the Democratic party and its chosen leaders. Sir, these things will startle the American people one of these days, if they have not done so already, when they come to be considered, pondered and weighed, as they must be. And, sir, the effort which is made here to-day is but the seconding of the miserable lies and slanders heaped upon these brave men. What a singular spectacle is that to which I have adverted.

Almost every Democratic Governor at the breaking out of this rebellion is now in arms against the Government; and your Democratic candidate for President—aye, the highest position within the gift of the people—is now a rebel in arms, and is levelling his weapons against our sons and brothers, and your candidate for Vice President on the other ticket is his brother in arms. With these startling facts before you, will you still turn your back upon those true and loyal men of that party who remain true and faithful to the Government?

Sir, it has been well said that you cannot escape history. No, sir; the record of to-day will be impartially written down upon its teeming pages! and you must stand or fall by this imperishable record. Do you think it such an one as you, and your children after you, will look upon with pride? And my Democratic friends, do not be deluded with the idea that you can uphold or sustain the government by your present course. It is a miserable delusion. The old Federal party composed of many true and loyal men, tried the experiment, but opposition to the administration then in power, soon drifted into opposition to the war itself. The old Whig party—in which I gloried so greatly in the past with its historic names, tried the experiment of opposing the administration of James K. Polk, while, at the same time, professing to be true and loyal to the government; I believe that they were true and honest in their heart of hearts; but when for the sake of party, they forgot their country, and when Thomas Corwin, speaking for the Whig party, said that if he was a Mexican he "would welcome our brave soldiers in Mexico with bloody hands to hospitable graves," he dug the grave of the old whig party so deep that the eloquence of a Clay and the genius of a Webster failed to disentomb it. And you who are opposing this administration, I tell you that you will sink to a damnation so deep and an oblivion so profound that the trump of the resurrection morn will fail to reach you. Aye, you may smile now, but there was not a tory in the revolutionary war who was not as honest as you are, there was not a blue light Federalist in the war of 1812 who was not as honest and sincere as you are to-day. But they have gone down to immortal infamy; their children blush for them, and their grand children weep for them at their firesides, and speak their names with sorrow and shame! And your names will be covered up in infamy. There are many sincere and earnest men in your ranks, but don't be so blinded by party, I entreat you, as to forget your fealty to your country! Sir, what is party and all its ties in comparison with the mighty interests which are now at stake? They are but mere chaff in the wind. Why should you refuse to

Andrew Johnson and Senator Wright the privilege of uttering their sentiments upon this floor, in the capital, or anywhere else! Are they not true and loyal men? In the mildest view of the case, will not your refusal be a matter of suspicion? The Senator from Berks denounced them as usurpers. I was sorry to hear such language fall from his lips, that Andrew Johnson was not the Governor of Tennessee. Perhaps he is not the Governor of Tennessee according to the strict forms of the Constitution; but, sir, he is the Military Governor of Tennessee, and just as rightfully rules there as the Chief Executive rules in the Capitol at Washington—just as rightfully as George B. McClellan ruled when he was at the head of the army and commanded your hosts—just as rightfully as Joseph E. Hooker commands, to-day, the forces of the United States. Sir, they are merely the appointees of the President of the United States; they exercise their functions by virtue of the authority conferred upon them by the President of the United States, as Commander-in-chief of the army. Andrew Johnson is the Military Governor of Tennessee. Both of the gentlemen whom it is proposed to invite here were Democrats; I do not know but that they are still Democrats; I have never heard a sentiment from them which indicated to me that they were anything else than Democrats; but they are true and loyal men; they are earnest in their efforts to overthrow and crush this hellish conspiracy against the liberties of the country; they are earnest and zealous in their efforts to build up and maintain this glorious fabric of liberty that we all loved so much in the past, irrespective of party. With what memories is the progress of our country intertwined? How admiringly we gazed upon the greatness of America, irrespective of party, Democrats and Whigs alike; all men could stand side by side in the contemplation of our country. Now, here are men who are nominally Democrats, and the only thing you can say against them is that they are Union men; they are for the Union right or wrong, without qualification. That is their only creed. They are for sustaining this nation by all the powers of the Government. If that is wrong, if the utterance of such sentiments as these is wrong, then these Democratic friends are not entitled to a hearing. But I will not refuse to any such man the right to be heard; I will not refuse to G. B. McClellan, did he come here to-morrow, the right to speak his sentiments in the halls of Pennsylvania, nor any other true, earnest and loyal man.

Sir, I am sorry that the miserable trick of a demagogue is brought in here in order to break down this resolution of invitation to those two great, distinguished and loyal men. I mean the amendment offered by the Senator

from Clarion. The country will see the trick and estimate it at its true worth. You cannot hide or cover it up; you cannot break your fall, Democrats, by refusing the use of this hall unless its use is extended to General McClellan. When George B. McClellan asks for the use of the halls of Pennsylvania he shall have them, so far as my vote is concerned, with a hearty Amen. Whenever he asks that, or you, his friends, ask it for him, you will not find my vote withheld. But, sir, why is this proposition coupled with a simple resolution to allow two distinguished and eminent men of national reputation, to speak for the Union, the Constitution and the laws, in the hall of the Senate? Is it to divert public attention from their own course—is conscience already at work condemning the great wrong before it is perpetrated? If this be so, beware, and take warning from its silent admonitions ere it be irretrievably too late.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, and feeling and knowing that the amendment of the Senator from Clarion is only a "tub thrown to the whale," and designed, if possible, to break the fall of our Democratic friends, which they must see and feel is impending, and with the hope that the resolution will pass as originally presented, I leave the subject to the conscience of each member of the Senate.

Mr. CONNELL. I move that the subject before the Senate be postponed for the present, with a view of making a motion for an extension of the hour of adjournment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CONNELL, the hour of adjournment was extended until the subject should be disposed of.

The consideration of the subject was then resumed.

Mr. LAMBERTON spoke in opposition to the resolution, during which the following remarks occurred:

Mr. LOWRY. The remark is, that the Senator from Clarion mistakes the place where he stands, and thinks that he is speaking in Richmond instead of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LAMBERTON. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to denunciations from that quarter before. We have been called "copperheads," and "traitors," and have borne it patiently; and now that Senator again insinuates disloyalty against me. Sir, I can tell him that imputations upon my loyalty have no terrors for me, when they come from one who once offered a premium on murder.

Mr. LOWRY. Will the Senator state to what he makes allusion when he says I offered a premium on murder? I pronounce him a falsifier.

Mr. LAMBERTON. I hurl back the epithet of that Senator and repeat and shall endeavor to prove that he did offer a premium on mur-

der. And the Senator can resent it either here or elsewhere, as he may see proper.

Mr. LOWRY. I give the Senator notice—

The SPEAKER (resuming the Chair.) There must be no personalities in the Senate.

Mr. LOWRY. I give the Senator notice—

The SPEAKER. The Senator will not make any personal remarks.

Mr. LOWRY. I ask the Senator from Clarion to wait one moment. I ask the Senator wherein I have offered a premium on murder.

Mr. LAMBERTON. I will state, sir.

Mr. LOWRY. I now give him notice that inasmuch as he has thrown out what he has, I shall hold him to it before he leaves this hall.

Mr. LAMBERTON. I shall not shirk the issue, and will now state, and the Senator from Erie dare not deny it, that in a public letter or speech, during the present rebellion, he stated that had he the power he would offer one hundred and sixty acres of land to every negro who would bring his master's scalp to him. Am I correct?

Mr. LOWRY. I rise to explain.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine his remarks to a mere explanation.

Mr. LOWRY. I rise merely for that purpose. In a speech delivered at the out-break of this hell-born and hell-bound rebellion, I uttered some great truths which caused wicked men to hound me at home and persecute me in strange cities. The crime which I then committed, and for which two years after its utterance, I am called to answer in the presence of the Senate and the country as a murderer, was this: I said that slavery was the powder, the ball and the bullion of this rebellion. I contended that every negro we took from the enemy's ranks, or from his fields, and placed in our own, we saved two fair weeping mothers' white sons. I believed that every wench we took within our lines we captured a cannon from the slaveholders' rebellion, and that for every negro child we unchained we captured a hogshead of saltpetre. I said then, and I believe now, that the destruction of slavery is the only cure for the rebellion, that all other soothing nostrums were quack medicines. I proclaimed it in bold words to a people who appreciated it, and to men in high power, who would not, that were I commander-in-chief of the army and navy, I would inscribe upon every banner that I sent into disloyal ports and into disloyal States the inspiring and soul-stirring words, universal emancipation.

I contended that liberty was not a lie, and that the negro would fight if judiciously invited and placed under the command of those who believed in liberty and not in the divinity of slavery.

I believed then and now that He who watches over the sparrow, will chastise us

until we will be just towards ourselves and toward four millions of God's poor down-cast prisoners of war. I said that I would arm the negro—that I would place him in the front of battle—and that I would invite his rebel master with his stolen arms to shoot his stolen ammunition into his stolen property at the rate of a thousand dollars a shot. I said further, that were I commander-in-chief, by virtue of the war power and in obedience to the customs of civilized nations and in accordance with the laws of self-preservation, I would confiscate every rebel's property, whether upon two legs or four, and that I would give to the slave who would bring me his master's disloyal scalp, one hundred and sixty acres of his master's plantation; nor would I be at all exacting as to where the scalp was taken off, so that it was at some point between the bottom of the ears and the top of the loins. This, sir, was my language long before Fremont had issued his immortal proclamation. The logic of events is sanctifying daily these anointed truths. Father, forgive thou those who deride and vilify me, because I enunciated them; they know not what they do.

I believed then and now that slavery and freedom cannot exist under the same Government, and that this Government will be saved and exist when copperheads are eternally damned. I have the most abiding faith.

Mr. LAMBERTON. The Senator's statement confirms what I have uttered: that he would give one hundred and sixty acres of land to the negro who would bring his master's scalp.

Mr. LOWRY. I said the slave of every disloyal master who held arms in his hand against the Government. I will not permit that Senator to misrepresent me.

The SPEAKER. The Senator from Clarion will see that the Senator from Erie explains his remarks to apply to disloyal masters.

Mr. LAMBERTON. Very well, sir, but I desire to ask the Senator from Erie one question. If a slave murders* and scalps his master, or if a slave insurrection takes place, I would like him to state whether the teachings of history do not inform us that the infuriated passions of the negro, once aroused, will cause him to bring along with the dripping scalp of the master, the scalps of the innocent mistress and her children? Doubtless they'd think the reward would be increased with every additional scalp.

Mr. LOWRY. I will say that in the speech to which I referred I made use of the remark that the South would bring upon itself the scenes of St. Domingo, and that the whole South would suffer the consequences of its own act.

Mr. RIDGEWAY. I offer the following as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Clarion:

"And that when Major-General George B. McClellan, or any other friend of the Union, desires the use of this hall for the purpose of defending the cause of the Union and denouncing the rebellion, it will be cheerfully tendered."

The question being on the amendment of Mr. RIDGWAY to the amendment of Mr. LAMBERTON.

Mr. LAWRENCE, (the Speaker) addressed the Senate on the amendment and original proposition. He said:—Mr. Chairman. when the Senate did me the honor to select me as its chief officer, I did not expect to allow myself to come to the floor and participate in your discussions, on common questions; and until the present have adhered to that rule which I laid down for my own action. When I entered the chamber this morning I had not the most distant idea of speaking on any question. My Democratic friends on the other side of the hall know well that there is not one of them for whom I do not entertain the highest respect; and in all the duties devolving upon me while in the chair, they shall have impartial justice meted out to each, at all times, to the same degree that I extend it to my own political friends. But, Mr. Chairman, who could sit still in a discussion like this and not feel deeply? You, sir, have exhibited deep feeling, and every patriotic and loyal man here is interested, deeply interested, in the discussion and decision of this question, and is anxious to give his vote and his voice on the side of his country and its friends. Yes, you saw the Senator from Erie unable to speak because of his feelings, but his tears were as eloquent as his words would have been. What is the proposition here? It is simple and plain. The Senator from Indiana offers a resolution offering the hall of the Senate to two distinguished gentlemen, in which to address the loyal men here, both of whom have held the highest offices within the gift of the people of their own States, and have always been consistent and faithful Democrats—both acting heretofore with the party to which you and I are opposed. I am informed, unofficially, (but I understand it to be true,) that the hall of the House has just been refused by the dominant party there.

At a meeting last evening held here, without distinction of party, a committee was appointed to receive and invite these gentlemen to address the citizens of Harrisburg and the Legislature; but now they are to be refused a hearing. Are our Democratic friends afraid that these patriotic men (both of whom have rendered signal service to the Government, and one of whom have lost all but his personal honor at the hands of the rebels,) may speak in favor of the Government of our fathers? Are they afraid that their eloquent appeals for

the Union and the Constitution will be inimical to their policy, which is now being defined and generally understood; will they not allow a patriotic Democrat to avow publicly his fealty to the cause of his country? Why, sir, it seems to me, and I have watched very carefully the action of the leaders of this modern Democracy, that if a man is found devoted to his country, to its cause, in love with its institutions, and if he has imperilled his life to aid in its rescue from the hands of traitors in arms—he is to be ostracised, *to be neglected, to be denounced and villified* as a fugitive, a hireling a stipendary, an abolitionist. Is this the position of the leaders of the Democracy? Why, sir, I see it in my own county, and I have heard of it in the county of Fayette; and here I will remark that in that county the feeling is so strong against the Government that I have heard men say if Lincoln and Jeff Davis were rival candidates, the traitor would have a majority of the Democratic votes.

MR. FULLER. The Senator from Washington was misinformed. While I admit there are too many disloyal sympathisers in my county, yet the large majority of those whom I represent are eminently loyal.

MR. LAWRENCE. I trust that the Senator is right. I see evidences in my own county—in the organs of the party, the editors being personal friends, whom I esteem and respect, of a growing and increasing hostility to the measures of the Government, intended and calculated to aid in the suppression of the rebellion. Opposition to the Administration in its struggle to maintain the Constitution and perpetuate the Government by all legitimate means, shows a disposition to embarrass, to weaken and destroy the only legal and constituted method by which the institutions of the country can be saved; and such opposition is made all over the State; its object is to save and perpetuate the party if the Government should perish. Do not tell me that the leaders of this modern Democracy are loyal, that they love these incomparable institutions, when such action as we see here from day to day and all over the State by the organs—gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and tends to weaken and paralyze the strong arm of the Government. If you are honest in your professions of loyalty, rise above these party distinctions, look above the Commander-in-chief of the Army (the President,) and show your love for the free form of government which has conferred upon us all such a rich harvest of blessings, by looking to it and its perpetuity, even if you should despise those who administer it.

Appreciate for a moment the trials of the men in power. They grapple with the most gigantic rebellion the world has ever seen. They spend anxious days and sleepless nights,

and need the aid, countenance and support of us all, and if we are truly loyal, we will do like Andrew Johnson and Governor Wright, give it freely, despising that sentiment now rife, that we cannot sustain the Government, because it is not administered by a Democrat. Some make the proclamation of emancipation an excuse for their action. The war, they say, is for the abolition of slavery. *Every honest man* who reads and reflects, knows this is false, and that this was promulgated by the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy as an auxiliary or war measure, and that he had a right to judge of the probable effect of it.

It seems as if there are those here and elsewhere who would be willing to save the Union and preserve our nationality, if they could only save this divine institution of slavery; but if one or the other must go down in a night of darkness, save slavery—let the Government, with all its hallowed memories, be blotted out forever. Now, I am for saving the Union at all hazards, taking and using all kinds of rebel property for that purpose. I do not love the colored gentlemen so much, or hate them so much, that I would allow their present or future condition to interfere with my efforts or desire to preserve the Government intact. Let the car of the Union roll on—if slavery falls, let it go down. Whose fault is it? And let me say that this continued howl about setting the millions of slaves free, with the possibility of them coming north, is the artifice of low demagogues to deceive those who do not read or reflect. If free, they have no inducement to come north. Their labor will be needed in the south as before, and there will be a strong inducement for our free colored population to go south. I tell the people whom I represent, and all who hear me, when you hear any man, any leader of any party, appeal to the low prejudices of the people, telling them that there is any design or any wish to have southern blacks brought north, or that such a thing can occur to any extent under the proclamation, set him down as a demagogue, unfit to enjoy your confidence or receive your suffrages. I repeat, then, a man, to enjoy the confidence of the leaders of the Democracy, must declare himself in opposition to the war, and especially to the administration; hence it is, that these patriotic men are to be denied a hearing, and with these they denounce Gen. Butler, Gen. Dix, Dickinson, Stanton, Holt, and that patriotic band who have given their time, their talent, and some of them have offered their lives, as the best proof of loyalty.

I admit, Mr. Chairman, that the President has done some things I do not approve. He has not been as efficient and active as I should have desired, in punishing treason and traitors. He has been too kind, too forbearing. If he had hung (as I would have done) a few of

these traitors at first, the present brood would not be so extensive or so bold. [Applause.] This incipient treason is so rife here that some men will scarcely listen to a prayer for the success of our arms, or the perpetuity of the Union; but will denounce him who utters it as an Abolitionist and an imposter, forgetting and prostituting his calling, and hence it is not strange they will attempt to prevent free speech. I would like to hear from the lips of that patriot, Andrew Johnson, the story of his own wrongs, the host of Union men and women whose property was destroyed, who were compelled to seek shelter in the caves and among the rocks of their own native mountains. Yes, amid the general defection in Tennessee, and when the Democratic Governors of all the Southern States joined the fortunes of this miserable despotism, he stood firm, and exhorted his friends to rally under the Stars and Stripes, to cling to the old flag and all would yet be well. Will you not hear such a man, be he Democrat or Republican? But the Senator from Berks says he will not hear him, because he is not the Governor of Tennessee, as is alleged, and not entitled to any such appellation. What matters it, whether he is or is not Military Governor; he has been so by the popular voice, and is now upholding a republican form of government in the State against these tyrants and usurpers and is eminently entitled to our respect and gratitude. If the Government stands, and can be perpetuated against the traitors South and their allies in the North, the name of Andrew Johnson will be handed down to future generations, as an example of purity, integrity, loyalty in the darkest hour of our history.

Now, in all that I have said on this question, I have attempted to make a distinction between the leaders of the Democratic party and the masses composing the party. I am glad to know, that among those I have many personal friends, some of whom will not, I trust, join in this attempt to destroy the Union, and if divided, to drag Pennsylvania down and chain her fast to this Southern oligarchy of despotism. If I could speak to all such from this place, I should implore them by all the memories of the past, by the sufferings and perils of the present, by the hopes of conquering an honorable peace, establishing the government on a more enduring basis, to discard the teachings of all sympathisers with treason or traitors, and follow the old flag, by whomsoever borne, until traitors in arms and those too cowardly to bear them, are subdued. Although the horizon is now dark, and some are yielding to gloom and almost ready to despair, because of this division in the North, this attempt to weaken the arm of the government—this effort to demoralize the army—this Union, this nationality, will not

be lost. Let us all, in every sphere, do our duty to ourselves, our children, and our country, and trust to that Omnipotent Power potent to save men or nations.

MR. M'CANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, why this angry and discordant disputation here? What is the proposition which has been ruthlessly thrust upon us here to so divide us? Why, strange as it may appear, the proposition is merely to invite Gov. Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, to address us on the great political questions which have so divided us, and which have brought the most terrible of civil wars upon us. And why not extend the hand of fellowship and brotherly love to that great and mighty old patriot, who has thrown on the holy altar of his bleeding country, his property, his home and friends, his life—yea, his all, solely and exclusively for the good of our common country—to prevent traitors from polluting that glorious flag of our country, to which all true men and true patriots willingly bow the knee in adoration? Why refuse him an audience in the old Keystone State, where loyalty is presumed to pervade it throughout its entire length and breadth? Refuse a true patriot and loyal Union man the halls of the Capitol of this noble State, which has been first in filling up her quota of troops—yea, which has moved more troops in the field, and which has lavished out her treasure to a greater extent, than any other State in or out of the Union—to disenthral the oppressed of the South, and of Tennessee, and restore that Government which has been disrupted by traitors, and in the place of which terror and anarchy now reign supreme. Why then is he to be refused this small privilege? The Senator from Berks says it is because he has stood up for the Government and the Union of the States; because he has been the friend and supporter of the President of the United States; because he is not the constitutional Governor of Tennessee; that a usurpation of the government placed him there, and he cannot by any act of his, countenance that usurpation; that the Government at Washington is tending fast to a grand centralization of power by its continual usurpation since its coming into power. Who would have thought that this resolution could have been the pretext for such an unholy crusade against our Government and the loyal men who support it? Every heart should throb with emotions of love and of adoration for this Government; and we should take home as something near and dear to our hearts, patriots and martyrs, who have stood nobly up for their Government when traitors—yea, devils in human form, deprived them of all but life—when they refused to follow them in their schemes to destroy this, the greatest and best of governments under the sun.

I ask the Democratic party to point to one

single, solitary unconstitutional act of this Government since its inception. They say the writ of *habeas corpus*—that great writ of right has been unlawfully and unconstitutionally suspended. Is this the case? I ask the thinking and honest mind if this is true, and the response from every one is that it is false. That very Constitution of which they speak so much and know so little, provides for the suspension of this writ, in order to suppress insurrection and rebellion. The gentlemen say that it is only to be suspended in districts or States where insurrection and rebellion actually exists. Grant it. Then, where does not insurrection and rebellion exist, in some stage of the disease, all over this Government? If the people of Pennsylvania are as the people of Berks are represented to be, who would not listen to an address in favor of their Government, by men whose loyalty cannot be doubted, who have been tried in the fire of adversity and found faithful, why, certainly, if that Government has strength to maintain itself, it will suspend this writ in those districts, and punish traitors—yea, punish *Arnolds*—in a summary manner. How could you get a jury and judge to try traitors and have them executed, when that judge and jury will even refuse to listen to the utterance of loyal sentiments? It would be a vain and idle attempt; hence the Government of the United States, when armed traitors are in front, in open revolt against its authority—when they are attempting to pierce that Government to the heart—lo! in the rear is found a party of fault-finders and constitution-shriekers, whose every act, under a false and wolfish quasi loyalty, is to destroy this Government, because they temporarily are not in its high places; because they have not the spoils of office. What can the Government do? If it is able to preserve itself at all, it must suspend this writ for the time, and also not only arrest, but *suspend* traitors to the Government, both North and South. I am sorry to say it, but I do say that the man in the free North, who, when this glorious old ship of State is tossed by the mighty tempest of treason and open rebellion in the South (her very existence threatened; yea, while she is tottering to her very foundations)—when every loyal nerve is stretched forth, both of leader and follower, of soldier and statesman—when an herculean effort is made by her friends to preserve her—I say that the fault-finder in this hour of great peril, must be disloyal; he must be a traitor at heart, though his tongue lie and says he loves the old Union. The evidence of disloyalty is, that they refuse to go out in defence of the country, but withhold their means from its support. This is a strange and easy kind of loyalty, indeed. They say they had a triumph over us last fall, that the people rebuked the

Government for its alleged constitutional infringements. It was a triumph indeed. You disfranchised the loyal soldiery who were absent from their homes and native States in defence of their country. You illegally, by the partisan decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, shamefully disfranchised one hundred and fifty thousand loyal men, by deceiving and misleading many loyal men at home, by crying out "the enormous war tax," and "we are for peace," &c. You carried the State with less than four thousand votes. What a triumph you had? But I warn you now, that many of these disfranchised and defrauded soldiers who were deprived of the right of suffrage last fall by your base intrigue, ere another election will have served out their time, and again be among us. Then you may expect that punishment which your base and disloyal treatment of them deserves.

The shame and ignominy of disfranchising the noble soldiery of this State and others will rest on leaders of the Democratic party, to obtain a poor temporary triumph of treason. They point to what they call the "unconstitutional emancipation proclamation" of the 1st January, 1863, and say that the Administration usurped their power in this. Is this true? That enormous rebellion was backed up by more than three millions of slaves, who were strengthening the rebellion by raising provisions of all kind in vast quantities throughout the entire South to feed and clothe the rebels in arms against us. They were put to work on the rebel entrenchments to prevent the missiles from Union arms piercing the hearts of these armed rebels—yea, in many instances, they were armed and equipped as soldiers in the Southern ranks, leveling their deadly weapons at the defenders of this Government—in short they were used in every way in which men could be used to support a war. The President of the United States, in September last, three months before the emancipation proclamation of the 1st January, warned those in rebellion with arms in their hands that unless they threw down their arms and became loyal to the Government that he, by proclamation, as Commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, would proclaim these people to be free, and would enforce that proclamation as the army advanced, giving them three long months to desist from their hellish purpose to destroy the Government, and send in their Congressmen, and keep and maintain inviolate all the rights they ever had under the Constitution. And this, by the fault-finding traitors of the North, is called a usurpation of power and an Abolition extreme.

The impartial historian will record this proclamation as the highest bid ever made to any disloyal people to become loyal and save their favorite institution. They had time to con-

sider consequences and determine their course; and I know that the prayers of the President and all loyal people were that they would accept this offer, and thus terminate the rebellion; but disloyal men and traitors, north and south, counselled the rejection of the offer, and the South must suffer the consequences of their rashness. The Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States must conquer the enemy at all cost—and all loyal men will say to him, "if you can save a white brother or friend by arming and equipping an emancipated slave, in the name of High Heaven do it." The man who loves his country says "save her with or without slavery, save her with or without emancipation, save her with or without arming the negroes; but in the name of common humanity—save her in all future time as the great asylum for the oppressed of every land."

I know that the Senator from Berks is mistaken when he says that he speaks his sentiments and the sentiments of the people of this district and the sentiments of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania. I know that if the people of this great State were assembled in this hall to-day, and this question was before them, that three-fourths—yea, more, would not vote with the Senator from Berks, because they love their country: they love her free institutions and free government as they love their life.

Ah! could they refuse to hear a patriot speak in defence of his country and their country, when they have their sons and brothers and fathers in the tented field, braving the dangers of the battle-field, and the sickness and death of the camp for this same cause. Yea, whose sons, brothers and fathers fill thousands of warriors' graves, whose test of loyalty is the gaping death wound, received at the hands of the enemies of their country and their flag.

Now, I take it that the only test of a true love of government and of loyalty is in an undivided and unwavering support of your government, throwing upon her altar your life and property and your all, and declaring that "with her we will live and with her we will die." And when the fault-finder, who is always crying out against his government, and weakening all her efforts in this, her death struggle for perpetuity, is attempting to thwart all her plans and diffuse dissatisfaction among the people, by shrieking out that her acts are unconstitutional, when he is himself condemned and hurried into oblivion, erased from the hearts of the American people, he will live in memory only as Arnold, the traitor, or Burr. The loyal man and the true friend of his country will live enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen, and will be placed alongside of the immortal Washington.

Messrs. DONOVAN and WALLACE spoke in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. LOWRY.—Had it not been for the concluding remarks of the Senator from Berks, I would have tried to remain silent. I will not now attempt to cope with that Senator in a legal argument on whether Andrew Johnson is or is not technically Governor of Tennessee. It will not be denied but what he is the only Governor who is not in the rebel army. There I leave him. The President of the United States saw the legally elected Governor of Tennessee put the seal of the State in his pocket, take his sword in his hand, enter the rebel army and put to death those who would not enter under the rattlesnake flag. If Abraham Lincoln could not find under the Constitution the technical power to appoint Andrew Johnson or some one else, the voice of humanity and the dictates of common sense made it a duty incumbent upon him to do so.

The constitutional argument of the Senator from Berks may read well, it is plausible; but I hold that this government, like an individual, has implanted in its bones the inherent right to preserve its life; and those who deny it, and raise constitutional and technical quibbles, on their skirts rests more crime than man ever dared before assume. Blackstone has never commanded that any man should be driven through the wall before he raised his hand to preserve his existence. Technicalities have justly become odious in time of peace. A technical observance of the Constitution is the cowardly screen which will render those who urge them to stink in the nostrils of honest men. The gaping wounds of thirty thousand Pennsylvanians cry to heaven that technicalities and those who urge them shall be silenced, and that the loyal statesman's voice shall silence the petty lawyer's plea. The blood of our brothers—my own brother's blood—cries to heaven against them. And from this House let their denunciations be so loud that they shall be silenced till this war is ended. I stand not here to apologise for the errors of this Administration. They looked for encouragement and support too long from the Democracy of the North.

The Democracy started fair in the race to put down this rebellion. Events have shown that the great error the Administration committed, was a belief that the Democratic party would stand by them to the bitter end. They handed over the sword to those who now intend to turn it against us. Had they have started for freedom, the artillery of heaven and earth would, before now, have brought this rebellion to a successful termination. I contend that Abraham Lincoln, while actuated by the purest motives that ever actuated the heart of man, made a mistake for which we are now wading in blood to the bits of the horses. Perhaps it was necessary—I will not stop to find fault.

"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." The Senator from Berks shall not out-Herod Herod. There are those who, like himself, induced many a mother's son to enter this contest, and then, like the dog, returned to his secession wallowing. I have, in the district which I represent, a lamentable example—they are everywhere to be found. I ask the Clerk to read a letter which I have received from a loyal constituent.

[The Clerk read as follows:]

"The change in the language and conduct of the leaders of the Democracy in regard to the rebellion, is marked with alarm by many of us.

"Your competitor went before the people in 1861, and I heard him denounce as traitors those who found fault with the President for 'arbitrary arrests.' He said in words, 'Were I Mr. Lincoln, I would not hunt musty law books for a precedent to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, but I would suspend the writ and the traitors too.'

"A few days since I heard this same would-be State Senator say Lincoln was a tyrant; that liberty lay bleeding at his feet; that he was an usurper, and the days of free speech and a free press were gone; that Butler was a beast, a tyrant, a murderer; that his hands were red with the blood of Mumfred, whom he murdered."

Mr. Speaker, this prolonged war, this unscrupled slaughter, this foreign interference, is chargeable to those men. Had we have been a united people, or were we now a united people, the rebels would lay down their arms within forty-eight hours. The blood of the slain is bespattered all over Democratic garments, and their flesh-pots run over with their gore. They gave remarkable evidences on the onset of cheap patriotism. The South knew them better than we did. They prolonged the contest, thinking that they would return to their first love. The Democracy always intended to do this; but their recent emissaries at Richmond were snubbed. The loyal portion will from this hour stand by their country. The disloyal portion will attempt to carry on their guerilla warfare in our midst. I can respect such men as Breckinridge, who took his life in his hands—left his seat in the Senate and entered the rebel army. My contempt for those of his kind who remain at home is unutterable.

With all reflecting men, their audacity and cowardice must remain a wonder to the world. We are told here to-day—that in consequence of the emancipation proclamation of President Lincoln is their excuse. Abraham Lincoln issued that proclamation, whether from the fear of God or the fear of foreign intervention, is no part of my duty to inquire. History will record the fact that he hesitated to issue it until the Democracy should learn to love freedom more than slavery, and history will record another

fact, that as the Democracy grew older and more debased, they hung to slavery and entirely repudiated liberty; and as an evidence of this, let me refer to a few facts. Jackson at New Orleans, and Perry on Lake Erie, received the African, and made a good soldier of him. Congress pensioned the African who had fought for us, and an honest people thought none the less of the stars and stripes because he had fought under them. Who, Mr. Speaker, was among the first men on this continent to recognize that a negro had a right to slay a traitor? I answer General Butler. If Jeff. Davis lay stark and stiff before us, the Democracy on this floor would go in mourning if he had fallen by the hand of a loyal black man, under the command of General Butler, who voted one hundred and forty-eight times at Charleston for John C. Breckinridge. General Butler appreciates the cause of this war. He has heart and soul and brains—rare combinations in these days in the party with which he has heretofore acted. Because he has these rare points, he is “a beast,” “a traitor,” and “a murderer,” in the language of the Democracy. In the expiring moments of Buchanan’s administration, John A. Dix, Secretary of War, gave an official order to shoot down any man who would tear down the American flag; yet this has rendered him, in the estimation of the Senator from Berks, and all who act with him here, a fanatical abolitionist. I might continue a long list of loyal Democrats, who fear God and love their country, and, in every instance, those who have done so have lost caste with their old political associates. General Hunter was a Democrat, but he loved his country, he conquered his prejudice, and determined to put down this rebellion at all hazards, and straightway he became an abolitionist.

Thus are two classes claiming the name of Democracy. The copperheads and the loyal men, who acknowledge the wickedness of the rebellion and their intention to conquer it. Democratic Senators on this floor are the leaders of the former branch of the party, who sympathise with the men committing the atrocities narrated in the following letter:

More Rebel Barbarities—Men and Women Shot Down for Loyalty to the Union in Alabama—A Hundred Blood-Hounds used to Hunt Down Loyal People—Hundreds of Families Driven Out to Perish of Starvation.

WASHINGTON, Thursday, March 5, 1863.

The following has been forwarded to the headquarters of the army:

HEADQUARTERS, DISTRICT OF CORINTH,)
Miss, January 24, 1863. }

CAPTAIN:—I have the honor to submit a few of the outrages committed upon citizens of Alabama by the Confederate troops. While all their leaders, from the President down, are

boasting of their carrying on this war in accordance with the laws that govern nations in such cases, and are charging upon our troops all kinds of depredations and outrages, I think a few simple facts might put them to blush, and make those parties, and our press and people, who are seconding the efforts of Davis to cast a stigma upon us, ashamed of the work they are doing. I will state merely what I know to be true.

Abe Canadi and Mr. Mitchell were hung two weeks ago for being Union men. They were on the Hacklebon Settlement, Marion county, Alabama.

Mr. Hallwork and his daughter, of the same county, were both shot for the same cause. The latter was instantly killed. The former is still alive, but will probably die.

Peter Lewes and three of his neighbors, were hunted down by one hundred blood-hounds and captured.

The houses of Messrs. Palmer, Welsby, Williams, and the three Weitmans, were burned over their heads. The women and children were turned out of doors; and the community was notified that if they allowed them to go into other houses, or fed or harbored them in any manner, they would be served the same.

Mr. Peterson, living at the head of Bull mountain, was shot.

I am now feeding some one hundred of these families, who, with their women and children, some gray-haired men, and even cripples on crutches, were driven out, and found their way here through the woods and byways without food or shelter. All this was done for the simple reason that they were Union men, or that they had brothers or relatives in our army.

The statements of these people are almost beyond belief, did we not have the evidence before us. I am informed by them that there are hundreds of loyal men and women in the woods of Alabama, waiting for an opportunity to escape.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. M. DODGE, Brigadier General.

Capt. R. M. SAWYER, A. A. Gen., Memphis.

Mr. STEIN. With the gentleman from Erie’s permission, I would like to ask him a question. A great many members of this side of the Senate would like to have a definition of the word “copperhead.”

Mr. LOWRY. It is much easier for me to give a fac simile, if I could induce two or three of the Senators on that side of the House to go with me to the daguerrean gallery. A copperhead in the natural world is the most dangerous kind of serpent, for he strikes his venomous blow without the warning of a rattle; in the political world he is the meanest of all traitors, for with fealty on his lips he strikes the dagger of the assassin at the heart of his country.

Mr. STEIN. I doubt then, whether we have any such in the Senate chamber.

Mr. LOWRY. The Senator may doubt, and yet the poison of their bite is felt in every school district in the State.

The SPEAKER. That question is not before the Senate.

Mr. LOWRY. I deny it—both the question and the reptiles are here—and I say this looking in the face of disloyal Senators—to some of whom I do not desire to say it in offensive terms. Personally for the Senator from Berks, I have nothing but the kindest feelings, but he has out-maneuvered himself. His rival in the other house has voted to hear Andrew Johnson, while he has voted to stifle his voice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Berks has not voted on that question.

Mr. LOWRY. Fear not! I am a friend of the Senator from Berks, and if there is an honest man upon this floor and a conscientious rebel here, that gentleman is the man. (Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker, the Senator from Clearfield (Mr. WALLACE,) spoke ably and eloquently, cautioning us to remember that he is here fresh from the ranks of the people. That Senator should remember that he and others like him found their way into these halls, while his loyal constituents were on the battle-field and his neighbors at home were burying their dead.

That may all be, sir. The votes of those who were burying their dead were not counted. I have no doubt, however, but that that gentleman stood up before the people, as my rival did, and told them that he was a loyal man and would not look into musty law books for precedents for incarcerating traitors, that he would not only suspend the writ of habeas corpus, but would suspend the traitor also.

And yet that gentleman, if he were here, would no doubt act with the gentleman from Clearfield.

Others may do as they please. I mourn to see them leave this government. This people are my people—this government is my government—where it goes I will go—where it stays I will stay—with it may I be buried.

Had the proclamation been made when this rebellion broke out, I believe that the patriotism of the people would have sustained it; but, sir, time was fatal, for too many conferences were held between the Democracy of the South and the Democracy of the North. Mr. Lincoln, whilst he was trying to conciliate those men of the South, and those who agreed with them in sentiment in the North, waited until the heads of the lovers of freedom were wet with the dews of the morning, and was compelled to yield to the Christian opinion of mankind. It would now be far better for Pennsylvania and for the cause of the country, if some Senators upon this floor would go over to the enemy and use the stolen guns of this Government against us, rather than come here and embarrass this administration. It would

be a God-send for us all; it would be a God-send for this country, because we would know where to find them. It is unpleasant for me thus to speak. I use this language because I feel it to be the truth. I feel to-day that the Democracy upon this floor and our country's enemies are boon companions. If Jefferson Davis were invited here to speak they would give him leave, and openly reproach us as violators of the freedom of speech if we would not give him a reception. [Laughter.] Senators may laugh, but it is the grim laugh of death to those copperheads who try to grin with you. [Renewed laughter.] They feel it is true, every word I have said. They would give Jeff. Davis an opportunity to be heard here to-day. If ever I mourned in my heart, mourned for my country and mourned with shame for my State, it was when the news came over to this body that the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania had refused to grant the use of their hall to a Governor of one of the States of this Union, that he might speak of the crime of disloyalty. The Senator from Berks, in taking the same action upon this question that the House had done, I would hope knew not what he did. I tell him before the second Tuesday of October shall come round—before the 4th day of July shall arrive, when the convention shall make their nominations, the opposition which he has made to this resolution will bury him forty feet below the surface of the earth with his face downward—no Mary to weep at his sepulchre. [Laughter.] Last evening we had an impromptu public meeting in this chamber, in reference to the contemplated reception of Governors Johnson and Wright. Democrats of both Houses came here and took part in that conference. They participated in the arrangements for the welcoming of those Democratic apostles, and the programme was agreed upon unanimously. It was decided that those glorious, faithful old Democrats should be invited here. Then after this had been done, there can be but little doubt, the Democracy held a kind of underground caucus in the rooms of "the Golden Circle;" there they hatched treason, and they determined that it would not be safe for the warning Democratic voice of Andrew Johnson to be heard in Pennsylvania. They resolved that they would slam the door of these halls in the patriot's face. Let me say to those gentlemen that Andrew Johnson, though he should never open his lips in this State, will speak so loudly upon this question that he will be heard upon every mountain top and in every valley within this Commonwealth. He will be heard, and the sickly trick of the Senator from Clarion will be rebuked. We consent—as our record will show—that if Gen. McClellan should desire to come here at any time, we would hear him, but still the miserable, dastardly, cowardly, mean, low effort to

keep Andrew Johnson from speaking within these halls, was persisted in. Senators may shirk their duty to take this course; but if I should pursue that course and refuse to hear a patriot plead for his country, I should fear that I was sinning against the Holy Ghost. [Laughter.] I do not wish to be profane, but I mean by that remark that I would sin against my country; against light and knowledge. May God forgive them; I have not forbearing grace sufficient to do so. The Senator from Berks, the Senator from Clearfield, the Senator from Clarion—all know that the proposition to add the name of General M'Clellan was designed to silence the mouth of patriotism; and when we agreed to allow General M'Clellan the use of the hall at any time when he would signify his desire to come here, we stripped them naked and held them before the country, and still they were mad and rushed headlong on, and had not manliness to get up on this floor, express satisfaction and beat a retreat. I see upon the right of me the Executive of this Commonwealth, and I know that he can hardly keep his seat when he sees the Senate of Pennsylvania refusing a loyal Governor the right to be heard at a time like this. It was my intention to have spoken of the horrible crime of secession, and stripped the mark from those who are teaching the Calhoun States rights doctrine, that one State has the right to involve all in common ruin, or Sampson-like pull down the temple of liberty and perish in its ruins; but I will leave that exposition to the able hands of the legal gentlemen.

This Government is a pyramid of loyal hearts—they have strength enough in themselves to save themselves—but only the blood of redeeming grace can save a rebel or his sympathizers. Mr. Speaker, it is useless to go further. The Senators from Berks, Clearfield and Clarion, have gone over to their idols. Let them alone.

Mr. BOUND. Mr. Speaker, when these resolutions were introduced into this hall, I had no expectation of saying a word upon them. I had trusted that a simple resolution of this kind, involving the liberty of speech, would receive at least from that side of the hall no opposition—that gentlemen who had talked so long and eloquently and wept so many tears in behalf of their fellow-citizens deprived of the right of free speech, would not seek to close the mouths of patriotic men when they come into the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and ask to be heard for the cause of a bleeding and distracted country. I had hoped to God that this cup, at least, would not be presented to the lips of Senators within the Senate chamber of Pennsylvania.

But, sir, it is well that gentlemen should write their history; it is well that they should take the position to which the logic of events is fast dragging them; it is well that they

come up and meet the issue manfully. It is a credit to their honesty and candor, though it may be disgraceful in the sight of heaven and the world for their loyalty and patriotism!

Mr. Speaker, the Senator from Berks (and would to God that I had the eloquence of a Clay or the God-like powers of a Webster, to annihilate, at a single blow, the miserable sophistry and State rights dogmas that underlie and are interwoven with all his remarks)—the Senator from Berks, in his closing remarks, assuming an air of defiance toward the majority on this side of the chamber, says, "we will bring you back to the Constitution and the Union." Bring us back to the Constitution and the Union! When have we violated the Constitution or infringed the bond of union in the slightest degree? When have our voices or votes failed to be on the side of the Government, the Constitution and the laws—failed to be on the side of those brave men who are perilling their lives to day amid the snows of winter on the battle plains of Virginia? When have we refused men or money for the prosecution of the war to put down this iniquitous and infernal rebellion? Never. Can the gentleman say the same for the members of his own party? Can he say the same for his Vandalighams, and his Turpies, and his Mays, and his Coxes, who openly boast that they have not voted, and will not vote a single dollar for the prosecution of this war to sustain and uphold this Government?

Sir, that is the record which they have marked out for themselves; and Ancona, Johnson and Stiles from this State are not a whit behind them—that is the record which they are trying to mark out for the Democratic party everywhere. Bring us back to the Constitution and the Union? Would to God that the Senator in the honesty of his heart, and with the eloquence which he so readily commands, had appealed to his "brethren of the South," who are at this moment trampling under foot the Constitution and the laws he professes to revere so greatly—men who are drenching the land in blood in their mad efforts to destroy the best Government that the wisdom of man ever devised. Aye, sir, would to God that his eloquence had been bestowed upon them—these red-handed traitors—that he had shown some anxiety, at least, to bring them back to their duty as citizens under the Constitution and laws which they have violated. But like all the rest, he seems to see the wrong only on the side of the Government he has sworn to protect, and which is to-day struggling for its life. "Bring us back to the Constitution and the Union?" Sir, we are as loyal and patriotic as that Senator dare be. Our record is open for the scrutiny of the civilized world; and no act of ours, no vote of ours from any member of the party, high or low, that don't affirm unconditional loyalty to the Government, and the

firm resolve that the "Union must and shall be preserved."

Sir, that Senator has exhausted his eloquence in the vain attempt to bolster up the fortunes of General Geo. B. McClellan. Were I a military critic, no excitement of debate, nor anything else, would tempt me at this time to bring under review the character and the achievements of George B. McClellan. No sophistry, no trick, on the other side shall bring me to denounce, in the slightest degree, that man. When his merits and demerits shall properly come up for criticism, they will receive it at my hands, in the humble way in which I may be able to perform the duty. But, sir, the gentleman, with all the eloquence he can command, has endeavored to manufacture sentiment in behalf of a man, who, I am sure, cannot but regret the unfortunate position in which he is placed in connection with this resolution. He may well exclaim, "save me from my friends!" The Senator, however, is welcome to all the sympathy which he can manufacture in this way. But, sir, there are others who deserve some credit for military achievements; and there is one, in particular, who should never be forgotten by his friends; he who wreathed the first laurel for George B. McClellan's brow in the celebrated moon-light battle on the plains of Western Virginia, and first opened to him the pathway of fame. But there is no word of praise for that man—but on the contrary, the miserable hounds who do the dirty work for that sensation party are now on his track. I speak, sir, of Major General Rosecrans. [Applause in the galleries and on the floor.] The man who never lost a battle! And while I would withhold no laurel from the brow of McClellan to which he may be entitled, I cannot forget that there are generals in the field equally meritorious, and who deserve your resolution of invitation just as much as George B. McClellan can possibly do. Rosecrans on the battle-field with his sword gleaming in the air and his eagle eye flashing fire and defiance to the enemy. Sir, he writes his name with the point of his sword in the blood of traitors, and at the same time with a pen of burning eloquence he writes home the advice, which, he thinks, should be given to all true patriots. What does he say in his letter to the Ohio Legislature?

"This is indeed a war for the maintenance of the Constitution and the laws—nay, for national existence—against those who have despised our honest friendship, deceived our just hopes, and driven us to defend our country and our homes. By foul and wilful slanders on our motives and intentions, persistently repeated, they have arrayed against us our own fellow-citizens, bound to us by the triple ties of consanguinity, geographical position, and commercial interest."

That is the voice of a hero from the battle-

field, who, in his allegiance to the country, in his devotion to the cause of liberty throughout the civilized world, and to the institutions founded by the wisdom and genius of our sires in the Revolution, goes forth with his sword drawn, without inquiry for a moment whether there is a constitutional impediment in the way. He goes without an inquiry as to the policy of the Administration. He recognizes the duty of the soldier to battle on the field and to achieve victory, leaving the civil policy of the Government to those who are invested with civil power. His allegiance, sir, is not bounded by any qualification—by any "if" or "but." He is for the Constitution, the Union and the laws—aye, sir, and he is enforcing their burning principles upon the battle-fields of the West at this hour. Yet we have from the gentleman on the other side no word of sympathy for him nor any of his brave comrades on the field of battle. But let this pass.

But, sir, what is no less remarkable during this entire discussion, and the studied abuse of the President and misrepresentation of his policy, I have listened in vain from that side of the chamber for one single word in condemnation of this infernal rebellion. Is not this fact startling and passing strange from men professing to be loyal and patriotic? Is it not surprising that Democratic Senators—while the Government is tottering upon the brink of ruin, and struggling for its life with all the energy of a dying man, can find no word of condemnation for the hellish architects of all our misfortunes; that while they are profuse in epithets against the Administration at Washington, they make no complaint against Jeff. Davis at Richmond? While patriots are denounced without stint—not one word is heard against TREASON AND TRAITORS?

On the contrary we hear enunciated, with all the vehemence of impassioned eloquence, an approval of the very doctrines which underlie atrocious rebellion—doctrines, which if recognized as true and as directing the policy of this Government, would prove that the rebellion is right and that all our efforts to crush it are wrong. Sir, I mean the doctrine of State rights, or the right of a State to secede from the Union at pleasure.

Gentlemen talk here about fealty to the Administration and about arbitrary arrests. Why, sir, is there here any man of the capacity of an ordinary donkey who does not know that a military commander has the right to arrest without a warrant? And although your Constitution declares that no man shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, except by due process of law, is it not a matter of every day history that persons taken as prisoners of war are tried by a court martial—are deprived not only of their property but of their lives, without a trial by jury, although in a civil proceeding that right is guaranteed by your Constitution?

Sir, you cannot carry on a war upon peace principles. You cannot by a written Constitution respond effectively to bayonets and cannon balls. You must take a bold and manly position and meet force with force; you must overthrow treason with the weapons which God has provided, and which the genius of man has placed within your reach. Yet gentlemen talk about arbitrary arrests, they expend their sympathy upon such traitors as Boileau; they bring in resolutions requiring the Governor of the Commonwealth to convert himself into a police officer and go to Washington city to inquire of the President on what charges a prisoner is arrested—they would make him a mere lackey to travel about the country to the neglect of his official duties, inquiring into the arrest of every sympathizer with treason! But, amidst all this sympathy manifested over the arrest of traitors, I ask gentlemen on the other side where are your tears for the noble men—aye, and the noble women too—who are now lying rotting in southern prisons, denied all constitutional privileges, while you by your acts, by your voice, and by your votes are endeavoring to thwart the Government in its effort to restore their constitutional rights to these, your suffering fellow countrymen? Do you hear any complaints about the denial of the writ of habeas corpus to them by Jeff. Davis and his myrmidons? Are they not also citizens of the United States—are they not entitled to all the guarantees of the Constitution of which you talk so glibly? And what is their crime? Sympathy with treason and rebellion—the writing of articles destructive of the government and denunciative of our constituted rulers? Oh, no; simply that of loving their country beyond all personal considerations, and notwithstanding indignities, and scourgings, and stripes clinging for protection to the old flag of the Union.

Senators talk about arbitrary arrests! Why don't they know that any military commander has the right to make an arrest by virtue of his military power, and the right to try the offender when so arrested? The articles of war, in time of actual hostilities, are superior to the civil law. It is because the civil law, in times of rebellion and insurrection, is insufficient to overcome powerful combinations of men with arms in their hands, that the aid of the military power is invoked! You must resort to force—and without the authority to do more than the civil law authorizes, your military power would be a "mere parade." Hence arbitrary arrests are made. I do not pretend to justify all the arrests which have been made by the Government. Why, sir, look at the vast extent of territory which your Government embraces; look at the number of States and districts composing it—its teeming population. Why, sir, this vast Government of ours must act through agents. If those agents commit errors, and

engage in the work of opposing it at a most critical hour of the country's destiny? Are you going to denounce the Administration as usurpers and tyrants, and lavish upon them every epithet that can be invented? What is the Administration endeavoring to accomplish? To build up Abraham Lincoln, whose lease of power extends only two years longer? No, sir. As you know, and every honest man knows, it is to preserve the Constitution and the Government as they are. No sophistry can conceal this fact; no appeal to passion or prejudice can disguise it.

Gentlemen lay to their souls the miserable sophistry that they can antagonize the Administration and yet support the Government. There never was a more heretical doctrine enunciated. Sir, in time of war, the Government is supreme; the President of the United States is commander-in-chief of your armies. If you antagonize the Administration, you not only antagonize Abraham Lincoln, but you oppose every military and every civil ruler who exercises power by virtue of the President's commission. When you strike at the President of the United States you strike at the noble men who command your armies—men who are authorized and commissioned by the President himself. Disparage the authority of the President of the United States—take away from him his power and your civil and military fabric will crumble like a rope of sand. Away with such sophistry. You cannot antagonize the Administration and yet sustain the Government. When the Government usurps powers not delegated to it, there is but one way in which the citizens can proceed, and that is to revolutionize; if gentlemen are manly and courageous, that is where their opposition to the Government must lead them. Unless they are merely opposing the Administration in order to build up party and make party capital—if they believe that Abraham Lincoln is usurping powers which the Constitution does not authorize him to exercise—if they believe he is acting the part of a tyrant—they will resort to revolution, they will, if they are consistent and honest, resort to revolution. But, sir, there is no honesty in this opposition to the Administration. Sir, the record of to-day will condemn them—aye, it will pillary them with execration, holding them up to the scorn of the world through ages to come. Gentlemen must not flatter themselves that they can antagonize the Government and yet not strike at Hooker or M'Clellan and every brave soldier in the field whose right arm is nerved by that Administration which sustains and upholds them. Sir, when you strike at the Government—when you strike at the military commander-in-chief, you strike at brave men who have gone from your own fire-sides and hearthstones. If you shake their confidence in the President, you shake their confidence in the

officers he has placed over your fellow citizens now marshaled as soldiers, and you make them mere food for rebel gunpowder.

But it is nonsense in a great struggle like this to talk about the Republican party carrying on this war single handed and alone, with a fire from the Democratic party in the rear. The Democratic party must take the responsibility before God and the civilized world if they now cause a division in the ranks of the people; **THEY WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE!** It is nonsense to think that Abraham Lincoln, unsustained by the voice and the bayonets of the American people, can crush this rebellion. He is your constitutional President; he has the right to speak; it is his duty to act; and if he speaks and acts conscientiously, as I believe he does, it is the duty of patriotism to sustain and uphold him—not because he is Abraham Lincoln, but because he is President of the United States, endowed with a sovereignty which controls and directs every department of this great and glorious Government. There is where your allegiance is due; there is where duty points the way; and no miserable sophistry can hide the truth.

Gentlemen say they have heard the voice of the people at home. I say you will hear louder and deeper tones than you have yet heard. You will hear, as you are now hearing daily, the voices of those noble men to whom the leaders of your party in Congress refused to vote supplies. By your voices and votes in Congress, by the working of your party machinery, you are endeavoring to take away the power of the Government to protect and sustain those noble men now marshaled in the field; and you will hear their voices come up in thunder tones; you will hear yourselves denounced as they are denouncing the men who are engaged in this disloyal conduct. The army has already fixed the title of those men, and I am sorry that so many gentlemen here are taking it home to themselves, that they are “copperheads.” Such is the title which the army has bestowed upon these men who are opposing the policy of the Government and doing all they can to give aid and comfort to a rebellion that seeks to destroy this noble fabric reared at such an expense of treasure and of blood. And if you close your ears against their cries, the very blood of their murdered comrades will cry out against you!

The Senator from Berks says that he will not welcome here a “usurper and a hireling.” Would-to God that the Senator possessed the heaven-born genius which Governor Johnson possesses. “A hireling of Lincoln!” Why, sir, he is one of the noblest patriots in the land—a man who is willing to sacrifice all the ties of home and friendship—a man who is willing to take the sword in his hand and go forth to battle against even his own offspring. That man a hireling! A man who leaves his fortune behind him and comes forward to cling to the

old Government, to rally under the broad banner of the Union. That man a hireling who sacrifices all that is near and dear, and is ready to submit to imprisonment and death rather than prove false to his country's cause! That man a hireling of the Administration—a menial of the President! Why, sir, what is the test of patriotism and loyalty, if he has not fully met that test? Why, sir, a man cannot give more than his life for his country. We cannot, while living, do more than offer it up upon her altar! But when a man yields up all his possessions to the foe, leaves home and friends and family to serve his country, you call that man a hireling of the President, a usurper. If he is a usurper, then, sir, the President is a usurper, because all the powers that Governor Johnson claims to exercise he derives from the President. If the Senator, from Berks is honest in his declaration that Governor Johnson is a usurper, then the President is also a usurper, and the only consistent and honest course left for the Senator to pursue, is to revolutionize and inaugurate civil war here at our own fire-sides and hearthstones. Thus will his logic be carried out to its legitimate effect; thus will he testify to his sincerity and his honesty.

The Senator says that he cannot allow a hireling and a usurper to speak his disloyal heresies in the Capitol of Pennsylvania. Sir, we invite Andrew Johnson as a loyal man. We invite him as (what is rarer still) a loyal Southern Democrat! Sir, as I have remarked before, this rebellion owes its animating spirit and its supporting strength to members of the Democratic party. Every Democratic Governor in the seceded States is now a traitor in arms. Your candidate for President of the United States on one ticket, and your candidate for Vice President on the other, are now traitors and rebels in arms; and here, when we point you to a bright example of loyalty amidst all this defection in your party—when we propose to invite this loyal man to the capitol of the State in order to address his fellow-citizens with burning words of patriotic eloquence, you refuse to extend to him this courtesy because, in his devotion to his country, he does not stop to inquire whether the Administration has not done something that will prevent him from giving it his generous and unqualified support. There can be no other reason. A Democrat he always has been; and he has never renounced his Democracy. He is one of the bright examples among the Southern Democracy. But when I asked the Senator from Philadelphia, (Mr. DONOVAN,) who spoke about the loyal Democracy of the North, where was the loyal Democracy of the South, the Senator's tongue was as silent as death. Where are the loyal Democrats of the South? If Andrew Johnson is not one of them, where will you find them? When a bright impersonation of patriotism appears before you—a man who rises above party

and every personal consideration to the dignity of a patriot, and strikes boldly and manfully for his country without qualification or condition—you refuse to listen to him here in the Senate chamber of Pennsylvania. You pretend to do this under the forms of the Constitution which guarantees liberty of speech. Sir, I cannot recognize such argument as that. I cannot appreciate such loyalty or such patriotism! As they have made their beds, so let them lie in them!

Mr. TURRELL. I had not intended to say anything upon this subject; but I think that some remarks which have fallen from the other side should not go unanswered; and in what I have to say, I propose to be brief. Now, sir, what have we before us? A resolution inviting to speak before us two distinguished citizens of other States. Why do you propose to ask those gentlemen to speak in the presence of citizens of this Commonwealth? Because of the eminent services they have rendered; because of the distinguished character they possess before the country. They have made great sacrifices, and done great service in the cause of our country, and therefore we deem them worthy of high honor.

It is said by the Senator from Berks that this is a party trick; that this is one of the things of political machinery. Sir, I deny it, and I appeal to the facts upon the record here. The meeting held last evening, which appointed the committee of invitation, was a meeting without distinction of party, and yet Senators come here to-day and say that this is a piece of party machinery. Sir, this is not true.

The Senator from Berks (Mr. CLYMER) asks if the distinguished Democrat who has recently been elected to the Governorship of the State of New York was passing through here to-day, would he be invited to speak before this Senate? Sir, the test fails. What has that man done to entitle him to such an invitation? Place him in contrast with Andrew Johnson or Gov. Wright! Why, sir, the position of Gov. Johnson of Tennessee, and Gov. Seymour of New York, before the country, are as wide apart as Heaven and earth. (I was near saying a lower place than earth, but will not. I'll only think it.) Sir, I ask the Senator from Berks, when he presents the name of Governor Seymour to us in this connection, and, assuming we would not vote to invite him to speak in this hall, justifies himself in refusing to vote for the resolution to show us a solitary reason why this honor should be awarded to him, or why such a test as he has presented should be made here. Can he place his finger upon any act which Gov. Seymour has done to aid in putting down this infernal rebellion? Where was he during the two years preceding his election to the gubernatorial chair of New York? Was he endeavoring to assist in raising an army in his own State? Has he lifted a

finger, given a dollar, or given a moment of time to that end? It was charged upon him in the canvass last fall that, while the patriotic men of that State were endeavoring to raise volunteers, Gov. Seymour was rustivating in the wilds of Lake Superior. That is the man who is presented here, and by whom our votes on this resolution are to be tested. Now, sir, these things were published in the papers in the State of New York at the time of the election canvass, and were not denied. During the summer of 1861, if not also that of 1862, that man was not in his own State, and was not doing a single thing to encourage the raising of troops to put down this rebellion, or endeavoring in any way to sustain the Government. The gentlemen on the other side cannot point to a single word or act of Gov. Seymour by which he has attempted to aid the patriotic men of that State in their noble efforts to sustain our National Government.

Mr. DONOVAN. I desire to make a remark.

The SPEAKER. Will the Senator from Susquehanna permit himself to be interrupted?

Mr. TURRELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONOVAN. The name of the Governor of New York is not contained in either the resolution or the amendment before the Senate. It is the name of General George B. McClellan that we propose to insert in that resolution. I would remind the Senator from Susquehanna that no reference is made to the Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. TURRELL. It is evident from the remarks of the Senator from Philadelphia, that he has not been paying attention to the debate. If he had been, he would have heard the Senator from Berks introduce the name of Gov. Seymour, and have understood the object of it. He is entirely at fault, and his remarks therefore go for nothing.

The Senator from Clarion (Mr. LAMBERTON) proposes to amend by extending the invitation to Gen. McClellan. This, sir, necessitates an examination of his claims to such courtesy. I know, sir, some men have said they would not criticise the conduct or military character of Gen. McClellan. Sir, it is our privilege to scan closely the character and conduct of our public men, and I for one will not shrink from it, especially in this case, where the friends of the General, by the proposed amendment, challenge such criticism. By his amendment, the Senator from Clarion says, that in his estimation, in his judgment, George B. McClellan stands upon the same platform, and is entitled to the same courtesies, as are to be extended to the gentlemen to whom the original resolution refers. I deny it, sir. He may adore McClellan if he pleases, and if he has a telescopic vision he may find in the military character of that man or in his acts that which may excite

his admiration. I can find nothing of that kind.

The Senator from Clearfield (Mr. WALLACE) asks us to go back with him to the summer of 1861, and thereupon launches forth in glorification of his favorite. I will go with him and follow him during that period. Sir, the history of George B. McClellan in this war, prior to the battle of Bull Run, has been adverted to by the Senator from Northumberland, and I will leave that and look at his subsequent career. But, before doing so, as the Senator from Clearfield has referred to that subject, let me ask why the battle at Bull Run was lost, and defeat and disgrace cast upon the army and upon the Government? Because, sir, of disobedience of orders on the part of Major-General Patterson—a life-long Democrat. The dispatches of Gen. Scott to Gen. Patterson at that time, were subsequently published from the note-book of Gen. Scott, and about that time were exhibited to the member of Congress from the Luzerne district, who repeated them to me. They show that Patterson was ordered by Scott to prevent the junction of the forces under the rebel General, Johnson, with the rebels at Manassas. He was ordered, first, to attack Gen. Johnson, if he thought he could successfully; and, if he could not do that, he was to occupy that General so that he should not fall back upon Bull Run. In case of his inability to do either of these things, he was directed to report himself in front of the enemy at Manassas, as soon as Johnson could join the rebel army. He did neither; he attempted to do neither: and that was one grand reason why that battle was lost, and it has now passed into history.

In this connection, I may refer to the conduct of Gen. Miles. (I do not know whether he is a Democrat, or to what party he belonged; I know one thing, that he lived south of Mason and Dixon's line.) That General, when ordered by his superior officer to bring up the reserves which he commanded, did not comply with the order. These are two good reasons why that battle was fought and lost; and I may state, further, that this and the subsequent course of that man, Miles, justifies us in believing him to have been a coward or a traitor, or both. He basely, without cause, surrendered the fastnesses of Harper's Ferry, and yet, with all these things before them, gentlemen stand here and ask us to go back with them to the record. We will go back with them to the record inch by inch.

Sir, it has been said that all was dismay and gloom until McClellan took the helm and organized a disjointed army. It may be so, sir. But it is one thing to organize an army, and another to have the courage, talent and ability for leading it on to victory. It has been truly said by the Senator from Erie "that General McClellan remained inactive for eight months,

with the best army the world ever saw, with the best appointments and the best provisions, before an enemy with wooden guns." For that period, he did nothing—absolutely nothing, except to glorify himself by exhibitions before that army. He chose rather, during that time, to gratify his vanity by a little military pomp and show, and to strut before his army, at grand parades, with a feather in his cap, than to lead that army, who were anxious and itching to fight the enemy whom they were sent to fight, and over whom, if they had fought, they would have proven victorious.

But again, sir, that army, as we know from its subsequent history, went on its way to Richmond. Previous to that, however, this man who is so glorified by the Senator from Clearfield and so adored by the Senator from Clarion, called a council of his able generals to decide whether they should attack Manassas. Heintzleman, and other gallant leaders, were in favor of making that attack. Where, then, was this great George B. McClellan? He did not even deign to attend the council which himself had called! His chief of staff, Gen. Marcy, (who, I believe, is also his father-in-law,) after some parley, informed the council that McClellan would not be present, and that no plans of attack would be submitted to their consideration, and the council dissolved.

Mr. DONOVAN. I regret very much to interrupt the Senator from Susquehanna, but I am compelled at this time to correct a remark that he has made. He has asserted that the defeat of the national arms at the battle of Bull Run was owing to the disobedience of commands on the part of General Patterson. That Senator certainly does not know the facts, or he would not make such an assertion. I was in a position at that time to be made aware of all dispatches from the War Department to Gen. Patterson, and I never saw any dispatch directing that General to attack Gen. Johnson at Winchester. On the contrary, we received orders to hold Charleston from Bunker Hill, and prevent Johnson from occupying it.

Mr. TURRELL. The Senator from Philadelphia waited a good while before making his explanation; and after all, it does not amount to anything. If it had been made when that part of the subject was under remark, it would have been in better taste, and more in place.

Mr. DONOVAN. It amounts to a great deal, sir.

Mr. TURRELL. I stated the authority upon which I made the statement, and I state again, that the purport of the dispatches to General Patterson was stated to me by the member of Congress from the Luzerne district, by whom they were read in the note-book of Gen. Scott; and the judgment of the country upon Patterson is well settled.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the Senator allow me

to interrupt him again? I have another question to propose.

Mr. TURRELL. No, sir; such interruptions are not proper. I gave the Senator ample opportunity to say what he had to say. I have stated the authority upon which I made the assertion, and there I am willing to rest it.

I was about to say that the army of the Potomac, subsequently, under the lead of this great man, made its way to Richmond; and upon this point I will endeavor to be very brief. We have it from the testimony of a gentleman, who was confined in Richmond as a spy, who subsequently made his escape, (I refer to Mr. Hurlburt; I suppose that all who hear me have seen his name in the papers,) that there were four different occasions, when, after battles, more or less severe, which had taken place between our forces and the enemy, if our success had been followed up, we might have captured Richmond. Now, sir, this Gen. McClellan was at the head of the army—the man whom his friends so glorify; and he either did not wish, or he had not the capacity, to seize upon or improve the opportunities thus afforded him. I give the testimony as it is given by men who were there, and who say that it was admitted, that it was not concealed by the authorities and the people of Richmond, that, if those opportunities had been improved as they might have been, they would have resulted in the capture of Richmond. But, sir, I will not spend time upon this point, further than to say that it is stated by a writer in “Wilkes’ Spirit of the Times,” by a writer whom I suppose to be Mr. Wilkes himself, that, after the battle of Malvern Hill, where our troops performed prodigies of valor, and when they expected an advance, they were ordered to retire, and did so, leaving our dead to be counted by the enemy. Then, numbers of our own brave Generals wrung their hands with rage and mortification, and the gallant and now lamented Kearney, excited beyond endurance, declared boldly that it was from treason or imbecility, emphasized by these words: “I, Philip Kearney, an old soldier, declare this, and I hold myself responsible for the declaration.”

We find, in the course of events, that an order was issued directing the return of those forces northward; that Gen. Halleck, himself a Democrat, and therefore good authority for our friends on the other side, directed Gen. McClellan to report himself at Fredericksburg, with the forces under his command. In order to accomplish that purpose, all the vessels on the James river, and every other means of transportation, were placed under the charge of Gen. McClellan. How was that order obeyed? Gen. Halleck tells you in his report that this man did not begin to move his forces until eleven days after the order was issued. In order to show that there was no impossibility in this, and to answer the argument that

might possibly be started on the other side, that McClellan came as soon as he could, we have, fortunately, in marked contrast with his own, the conduct of another General there who received at the same time the same order. I allude to Gen. Burnside. Burnside received the same order, and, within three days after that order was given, he reported himself at Fredericksburg, with his forces. These facts point to but one conclusion, and I am willing to leave them before the country.

Our friends have alluded to the second battle of Bull Run. I will say, that if the orders which were given by Gen. Halleck to Gen. McClellan, previous to that time, had been as promptly obeyed, on the part of that General, as they were on the part of Burnside, our army would have then been on hand, ready for action, thoroughly organized and supplied, and those battles, instead of defeats, would have proven a series of death-dealing blows at this rebellion. Now, sir, if gentlemen on that side of the chamber may or may not like this review, they have invited and they have themselves to thank for it.

But this is not all. Subsequent battles were fought. Fortunately, we have the evidence, too, why they resulted in barren victories, if not defeat. Our information is not upon mere hearsay; it is the sworn testimony which has been given before a tribunal constituted by the authorities of the country. I ask the gentlemen why were those battles lost? Because of the demoralization of certain officers of that army, who failed to obey orders or requisitions which were made upon them, and for which one of them, sir—Fitz John Porter—has been court martialled and dismissed from the service in disgrace. I do not know what his politics are; I don’t care. He was one of the satellites of McClellan, as everybody admits. The feeling with which he had followed that man, controlled his action, and governed his conduct when he failed to do his duty and thereby brought defeat to our arms instead of victory.

I may say here what occurs to my mind in passing, that McClellan himself failed, on the same occasion, to respond to requisitions which were made upon him. But for those failures—first, of McClellan to report himself with his command at Fredericksburg, as he ought to have done, and when he was directed, to have handled his troops properly; and, secondly, the failure of Fitz John Porter to give support to our army contending with the rebels as he was required to do by the officer in command—the military commission, instituted as a court of inquiry, will tell you that but for those failures, that great and indefatigable leader, Stonewall Jackson, must have been captured with his army—that his capture was a foregone military conclusion. That is what we are told, by the military commission, upon the sworn evidence which was given before them.

Under the circumstances of the situation, McClellan was again placed in command. He followed the enemy through Maryland; but at that momentous period, when celerity in military movements was rendered imperatively necessary, he marched, as Gen. Halleck tells you, at the utmost—a distance of only six miles a day. When Harper's Ferry was in jeopardy, he pretended to desire to effect a junction with the troops there, and yet he crept along at a snail's pace, without, in fact, making any direct effort to accomplish one of the objects he pretended to have in view. Now, sir, I again refer to Gen. Halleck's own statement, and the report of the Military Commission, convened to investigate the facts relative to the surrender of Harper's Ferry, and both agree, and the record will bear me out in the assertion, that it was possible for McClellan to prevent the surrender of Harper's Ferry, and thereby would have put the rebel army at our mercy. Sir, as you examine the history of this man, everything detrimental to his character as a great military leader seems to accumulate and roll up mountains high against him.

But great stress is placed by our friends upon the battle of Antietam; and the Senator from Clarion (Mr. LAMBERTON,) speaks of that General as making "*a tiger spring*" upon the enemy. Why, whoever heard of a tiger taking six weeks to prepare for a spring. Six weeks after the battle of Antietam, during a season of the year which was best fitted for military operations, McClellan wasted, in idle inaction, and that, too, as we have it from the testimony of prisoners and deserters from the rebels, when the enemy were expecting an attack immediately, and when if they had been attacked, they must inevitably have surrendered or been captured. They were so weakened, demoralized, that they could not have made any successful resistance. But, sir, that was not done, though our army expected it would have been done; and if any one who now hears me has conversed with the officers or men of that army, he knows this to be the fact. I have conversed with many of the soldiers of that army, and, to a man, they inform me that they expected to be called upon, the next morning after the battle, to again attack the enemy, whom they knew they were sufficiently powerful to attack; but they lay upon their arms, disheartened and demoralized by the fact that that attack was not made.

But why did this man remain there inactive? There has been no good reason ever yet given to the public—never. We do know, sir, from the evidence which has been placed upon record, that Gen. McClellan, during this time, was ordered to advance by his superior officer, Gen. Halleck, and that that order was repeated until it was abandoned by Gen. Halleck in despair, and referred to the President; there-

fore, this man, who is placed before the country with so much pomp and vain glory, occupies the position of a soldier totally insubordinate, refusing to obey the orders of his superior officer. This is not all, sir. You find in the history of the war that when the commander-in-chief, Gen. Halleck, despaired of effecting anything by the orders he issued, that the President himself goes in person to visit Gen. McClellan, yet that General moves not, although the country understands that the President repeated the orders to advance, and returned to Washington. Yet this great General lingers. Ah, sir, if had but made that "*tiger spring*"—if he had pounced upon that broken, retreating rebel army—we would have had this infamous rebellion by the throat, and it would long since have been suffocated, crushed and destroyed; and he might have indeed justly claimed the admiration and gratitude of the country.

Sir, one of the first and highest requisites of the soldier, is entire subordination. McClellan's insubordination (to suppose no worse reason) being no longer to be tolerated, he was removed, and I have no doubt the whole country is satisfied now in looking over the record, and the evidence which has been disclosed, and which has accumulated beyond estimate, that he was rightfully and properly removed from the command, and that it would have been better for the land had he been earlier removed.

But the Senator from Berks says that to-day the army of the Potomac adores George B. McClellan. Sir, in a conversation which I had this week with an officer of that army, who had just come from the Potomac, that officer admits, that, at the time the change in commanders was made, his feelings were against it; but that the feeling for Gen. McClellan, of which we have heard so much, and, which, in view of the state of the army of the Potomac, no doubt existed, had now disappeared. In his opinion, the army was satisfied, by the disclosures made by the various courts martial, that that removal was properly made, and they were entirely satisfied with the general who at present holds command, and that he has their fullest confidence.

Now, sir, these are some of the suggestions (and I have not enlarged upon them as I might have done) which we have to make to the gentlemen when they invite us to this discussion. We have not invited this discussion—we make no attack on Gen. McClellan—but the Senator from Clarion has proposed to put him upon the resolution before the Senate, and of necessity he invited us to review his record.

I desire to say a word more, and I have done. The Senator from Berks tells you a great issue is before the country. I agree with him. There is a great issue before the people, and it is this, sir. It is not, as he has stated it, the

mere question of whether fealty to the Government and fealty to the Administration are different things, and are to be tried by the test which he supposes; but it is a question whether the North is to be subjugated and made the slave of the South, or whether we are to succeed in putting down this rebellion and securing the freedom of the whole nation. That is the question, sir. And in support of my position upon that question, I cite the gentleman to the authorities as they have appeared from time to time in the Southern papers, and as it was stated by Col. Hamilton, of Texas, during the canvass last fall. I cull from those authorities a single fact. About the time of the Montgomery Convention, a leading Democrat of the South published a letter in which he stated the issues and the object of this rebellion. That letter was copied with approval by all the leading papers of the South. In that letter the writer declared that the cause of the North relative to slavery was not the cause of the rebellion; that the leaders of the South had meditated this thing for years. We know, sir, that the history of the rebellion sustains that assertion; and the questions relative to slavery are the mere pretext. The leaders have all declared it since the commencement of the rebellion—that, for thirty years, they meditated the overthrow of our Government. Why, they tell you, and they tell the Senator from Berks and other Senators upon this floor, that they make no distinctions. They say, “It is because we do not like your form of government; because we want a strong government; this is the real object. We are the nobility—we, the slaveholders, are the governing class, and you are the slaves, the serfs—you are the menials;” and it is not but a few weeks since the same language was published by the Richmond Examiner. I read the article to some of my friends here in the library, as they will recollect. They treat us at the North as slaves, who have rebelled against their loyal lords, and they say we ought to be treated as such—that we have made some difficulty now, but they will subdue us, and when they get us once subdued they must take care and place us in such a position as that we will not be able to play such antics again.” Now, sir, if the Democracy of Pennsylvania like that doctrine—if they like the position which is thus given them—they are welcome to it.

But I was speaking of the testimony afforded by the letter to which I alluded, giving the true reason why this rebellion was inaugurated. They say they want a different Government, and that while the laboring people of the North—and I call upon every laboring man within the sound of my voice to note it—this is what the Southern men say—I do not give Northern testimony—that while the laboring men of the North have a part in this Government, it is not such a Government as they desire, nor such a

one as they wish to participate in. I give you the exact words when I use this language,—that, as long as that is the case, the Government is in the HEELS of society, and they refuse to participate in it; but when it shall be changed, when the lordly nabobs of the South shall obtain the control of it, and become the Government, then they say it will be in the HEAD of society. That is the feast to which the Senator from Berks and other Senators upon this floor are invited. If they like it they can take their seats and partake of it. We will have none of it.

Sir, this is the issue presented to-day to the country—whether we shall still have a free Government, in which all classes—whether the mechanic, the farmer, the merchant or the artizan, shall participate—or whether it shall be transferred to an oligarchy, constituted and existing in a few slaveholding nabobs, who claim the right to govern, because they have been brought up in the right of holding slaves, and because, from the exercise of that right, they claim to place us and all who labor in the same category.

Mr. Speaker, I have done. I have detained the Senate much longer than I intended, and although there is much more that I would say, I will leave the subject here.

Mr. DONOVAN—I would like to say one word before the question is taken. I merely rise for the purpose of correcting one or two unfounded assertions of the Senator from Susquehanna (Mr. TURRELL). That Senator stated while on the floor, in referring to the first engagement at Bull Run, that that defeat of the National arms was to be attributed to the refusal of General Patterson to obey orders. I will state (and for the benefit of the Senator from Susquehanna I will state history) that when a sectional party press attacked General Patterson for disobedience of orders, and attributed the cause of the defeat at Bull Run to a refusal of that general to discharge his duty, he went to Washington, week in and week out, and demanded of a Republican Congress a court-martial or a committee to investigate the base charges made against him. I say here, and I know it to be a fact, that Congress refused to General Patterson a hearing—refused to him the poor privilege of being tried by a court-martial. I say, too, in my place here, that a member of the cabinet told General Patterson, in my presence, that they (speaking of the administration) did not want an investigation then, that they did not hold him responsible, and that he ought not to censure an old soldier—General Scott—who was just retiring from the field of active life. Upon that statement, General Patterson did not at that time insist upon a hearing, and withdrew the papers he had filed for that purpose. Now, sir, all that I have stated in this connection is strictly true. The Senator from Susquehanna cannot

injure the character of that general by any assertions here that are not founded upon fact.

The Senator states further that it took General McClellan six weeks after the battle of Antietam to prepare to make a spring. Sir, General Burnside took time to make his "spring," and he made it. And where is General Hooker? It has taken him two months to prepare for a "spring" which he has not made, and which probably he will not make for two months longer.

Mr. TURRELL.—I stated the authority upon which the statements I have made were based; and I am willing to rest the matter there, so far as General Patterson is concerned.

As to the remark which the Senator has seen fit to make in reference to General Burnside and General Hooker, I may remind the Senate that the season of the year which General McClellan spent in inaction after the battle of Antietam, was the very best in the year, and that since the end of that season the weather has not been favorable for military movements.

While I am on the floor, allow me to say one word further—in relation to a remark made by several Senators, as an excuse for their present course, that, because the Legislature of New York refused to tender a reception to General McClellan, they are justified in retaliating in this instance. It is true that the Legislature did refuse to tender a public reception; and if they did, they were the proper judges of their action. The fact of such proceeding on their part does not furnish any reason or justification for similar action on our part.

It may be proper for me here to refer to the fact that the Senator's gallant countryman, the glorious Corcoran, was received with the most distinguished honors by the Legislature of the State of New York. That fact shows that their refusal to receive General McClellan was not dictated by party spirit, but that they could recognize and honor the gallant and the brave, while treating with contempt the man whom they deemed unworthy of his position.

Mr. DONOVAN.—I have only to say one word. I did not hear the allusion of the Senator from Susquehanna to my countrymen. They require no eulogy at my hands, for, in the language of one of their gifted sons, they have spoken, and they are yet speaking in tones of musketry for their race and for their Constitution.

Mr. PENNEY.—At this late stage of the debate, perhaps it would appear presumptuous in me to add anything to the very able discussion which has been had before the Senate. I have a single word to say, however, in reference to some things that have been said on the other side of the Chamber. And in commencing what I have to say at this time, I may be permitted to remark, that I feel, in common with every loyal member of the Senate, a dis-

position to accord to the Senator from Bucks (Mr. KINSEY) my most cordial approbation of the patriotic position he has assumed upon this question and upon the general questions before the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I think that he is one of those Democrats who are worthy to be classed with the distinguished patriot whom it is proposed to invite to address the Senate. I am glad to find that among the professions of loyalty, amid the sophistry that is used in those professions, we have in that Senator at least one man able to raise himself above the mere questions of party, and place himself upon the plain, fundamental principles of our own democratic institutions, and accord the largest liberty to every man who is willing to express his sentiments in defence of the Union and the Government which is in possession of the power of this great country. Sir, I am glad to be able to pay this tribute to the patriotism, the integrity and the upright position of the Senator from Bucks.

I have but a single remark to make, sir, in reference to the speech of the Senator from Berks—a Senator for whom I have a very high regard, and whose speech was clothed in the eloquent language which he is so well capable of employing—I say that the Senator's speech was listened to by myself with great interest, and I must not let the occasion pass without attempting, at least, to point out some part of the sophistry upon which he has expended so much of his eloquence. The question before the Senate, is simply, will the Senate invite the distinguished men named in the resolution to express their sentiments in favor of the Government before the Senate and in the hall of the Senate. The Senator from Berks, with the adroitness for which he is so much distinguished, passed over the main issue and attempted to divert the attention of the Senate from the question here by raising a question upon the invitation to the distinguished general whose name is mentioned in the amendment to the resolution. Now, sir, I am not, at this late period of the discussion, going to enter into any remarks whatever upon the merits or demerits of General McClellan. That is not the question before the Senate. The question is, will you invite or refuse to invite the distinguished men mentioned in the resolution to address the people of Pennsylvania in the hall of the Senate?

The Senator from Susquehanna (Mr. TURRELL) has reviewed the question with reference to this distinguished general. The Senator from Berks (Mr. CLYMER) stated in his speech that the Legislature of New York refused to that general an admission to their halls, that they refused to invite him or tender him a public reception, and he gives that as a reason why he refuses to vote for this resolution. That may be, and they may have had good reasons for their action. But the Senator forgot to tell us

that his party friends in that same State of New York did tender a public reception to the man upon whom this distinguished general relied perhaps more than upon any other—the man who perhaps shaped his own policy in the army—the man who was afterwards put upon his trial before a court constituted for that purpose—the man who, upon the fullest investigation, after he had had every opportunity of defending himself, having his friends in power around him, was tried fairly and fully, and convicted of crimes against his own country that ought, in the ordinary rules of civilized warfare, to have subjected him to the penalty of his life—that that man, when he goes out with the brand of conviction upon him, goes to New York and receives a public reception tendered to him by the party friends of these men who call themselves loyalists, and who say that they are loyal in their advocacy of the Government. There is a public reception which I suppose is satisfactory to the Senator. Make what you please of it. What does it mean? Are you loyal to the Government? Are you all loyal, and is that the way you sustain it? An administration, managing the affairs of your nation, put in place in the manner the Constitution requires, clothed with the Executive power of your Government, doing all it can to save the life of the Government in the best manner the Constitution authorizes them to do, and, in the exercise of that proper power, striking at traitors wherever they can be found—wielding all the energies of your Government everywhere against treason, to the best of their ability, and with the most honest intentions carrying out those measures, with true and patriotic desires to preserve our institutions, and when they find a traitor in their army—when they find a man unfaithful to the Constitution and the laws entrusted with our lives, with the lives of our brothers and sons upon the battle-fields—proving recreant to his trust, arraigning him before a competent tribunal, who convict him of the crime of being untrue to his Government, untrue to his oath, untrue to the stars which he wears upon his shoulders, untrue to every sentiment of patriotism, and neglecting his duty in the hour of peril—and when the corpses of thousands are crying against him, and when the judgment is recorded against him, and he goes out with the brand upon him, the Senator's party friends tender him a public reception; and yet, when the old patriot comes up from the very midst of treason, where he has resisted rebellion and traitors in every form, and asks to be heard, not as a traitor, but as a man, feeling in his inmost soul that the Government is in peril, and avowing his willingness to stand by it on all occasions and everywhere, and ready at every moment to lay down his life as a martyr to the cause in his native State—the same party, men who call themselves loyal to the

Union, say that he shall not be heard. You will hear Fitz John Porter; you will give him a public reception; you will tender to him the hospitalities of a State, while the brand of disgrace is stamped upon him, with his stars stripped from his shoulders and spurs hacked from his heels in disgrace by a court of inquiry, that has had full opportunity to determine what his rights are—you will give him a public reception; but you will not let Andrew Johnson set his foot upon the Senate of Pennsylvania to give utterance to a single word in favor of the Government he is sworn to support.

Mr. Speaker, there is a sophistry in the argument of the Senator from Berks, in attempting to distinguish between the administration, as he calls it, and the Government. What is the Government of the country? Where had it its origin? The fathers of the old Revolution framed our Constitution; they put into it the clause that established the executive authority. I may say, too, that in the very foundation of that Government an ancestor of the Senator from Berks held a prominent part, and in the old annals of the Revolution may be found the record of his honored name. It is questionable, Mr. Speaker, whether (and I say it without a single feeling of unkindness toward him) the speech of the Senator from Berks did credit to that signature. Suppose, sir, that one of the signers of that old Declaration of Independence which lies at the foundation of our Constitution and our laws, had been seated in your place, and had listened to some of the professions of loyalty that have been made here, what would he think of such monstrous doctrine? Loyalty to what, sir?—"Loyalty to the Government and the country," they say. What is the Government but the constitutional authority of the country. The Constitution has furnished you with the means of placing an executive officer in the Presidential chair. It has entrusted him and clothed him with all the executive power of the nation in his department. It has made him commander-in-chief of your armies. When a rebellion arises against the authority of the Government, it is his sworn duty to quell that rebellion and enforce obedience to the laws. What does he do? The moment that this rebellion broke out, when the first gun of Sumter sounded upon the ear, that sound, as the Senator says, consolidated the efforts of all loyal men of the North. It is true they were consolidated because that was the first impulse of their patriotism. That was the first impulse of the genuine, well founded patriotism of the nation, before party leaders had time to mouth their treason, and the people went as one man to the battle. That was the truth the Senator uttered then. But now party machinations, party devices

and party ambition has taken the place of love of country with certain party leaders, and we find a different state of affairs. When the rebellion is in progress, the President, ignoring all party in the patriotic devotion of his heart to his country, is surrounded by an administration which in their earnest endeavor to aid him have trusted to these weak promises of loyalty, trusted men that they ought never to have trusted, trusted them honestly and placed them in positions of power, which the subsequent history of the war has shown they were not worthy of. They have placed in power men who professed loyalty, but who, after obtaining position and influence, have, like the Senator from Berks, made this supposed distinction between the Government and the administration of the country, to cover up their disloyalty, and who have allowed themselves to say, "to be sure we are loyal; we are very loyal citizens—all of us—but we are opposed to the administration," and yet they have accepted offices under it to betray the country. The greatest fault of the administration has been the trust it reposed in such *Democratic* loyalty as we have heard to-day. "Opposed to the administration," says the Senator. How? Your President is commander-in-chief of the army. You are opposed to him—are you? So is every rebel in the land opposed to the President—opposed to the commander-in-chief of your armies? Then you are sowing broad cast sedition and revolt in the very armies that are in the field for the suppression of the rebellion. Call you that supporting the Government? How are you to be loyal to your Government if you are throwing every possible weight in the very pathway of your commander-in-chief who is attempting to march to victory over this red handed rebellion. Will you tell me that? There is the sophistry of the argument. You say, "we are opposed to the Administration and we would say to it, 'stop;' you are going contrary to law; call a convention; amend the Constitution before you proceed further with the war." Suppose you do call together a council of representatives from all the States of the Union—"a patriotic, national council," as you say—and invite to a seat by your side the red-handed rebels who come there with the blood of your brother on their hands—who have spit upon and repudiated your Constitution, and who have said it was not worth the paper upon which it is written—invite those men, who have spurned your proffers of peace, and let us see how the convention is composed. There sits your Democratic candidate for the Presidency, Breckinridge, as a delegate from Kentucky; on another seat is Bright, who was expelled for his treason; on another seat Jeff Davis; on another seat some other man, who has imbrued his hands in the blood of every innocent man and woman

who was not opposed to their country. Upon the action of such an august assembly you would have the President and the army wait before they presume to strike one blow against rebellion. That is the logic of gentlemen. "For God's sake, stop your operations," say they; "you are arresting traitors without warrant of law: let them go; the country cannot afford to let you arrest traitors now; there is no law for it; go to work and amend your Constitution; call your Congress and have them enact an amendment to that instrument." "Give the President power to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*," say they, "and then you may arrest these traitors." Is that the loyalty which now supports the government?

Now, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the army of the Potomac, and about the army on the field generally. What does it all go for? It is said that that army is to rebuke the people, that we are to leave our seats for new men to occupy them. Sir, if new men come here advocating the principles that have been advocated here to day, they will come here over a grave in which will lie buried the institutions of the country. If they come here elected upon the principles advocated here to-day they will come, I say again, over the graves of the best institutions of the country; they will come here in a revolutionary manner with the banner of rebellion in their hands. It is not true that the soldiers in the field endorse any such doctrine. When the Democratic organizations of the several States have assumed to impeach the integrity of the Administration in the conduct of the war, there has come up from the battle fields of the West and from the far Potomac of the East the rebuke of the soldier, from every camp of his country, with his sword by his side and his musket in his hands—from him comes up the response "down with all such treason; the army do not believe in it." That is the response and that will be the response from the loyal army. Yet Senators tell us they have won a triumph in this State. Mr. Speaker, they have won a seeming triumph, because the patriotism of the party to which I belong has exceeded the patriotism of their party, because in every tented field, east and west, the party that sustains the Government is doubly represented, while these plotters against the Government are at home hatching their treason. It is a party sustaining the Government. But because you, with a court of your own party predilections, have disfranchised a whole army in the tented field and said, "you shall not choose your rulers"—while that army, as the Senator from Erie has well said, was fighting the battles of the country, and burying our dead brothers and fathers on the field—the triumph of which you boast was achieved, but it was not a triumph

of any such doctrines as you proclaim here. You are mistaken in that. Upon the stump or anywhere, had you Senators dared to advocate what you have advocated here to-day, your seats would have been filled by other men. The Senator from Erie has given a good illustration of that. On that issue we will meet you anywhere fairly and the patriotic heart of the State will always sustain us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have but one word to say and I have done. Every man here professes to be loyal. It is not parliamentary to doubt or question the motives of members of the Senate. I do say, however, Mr. Speaker, that that loyalty which professes to sustain the institutions of the country and the Constitution of the country, and which at the same time asserts that the Chief Executive of the Government, who personifies the Government in his person, that the Congress and other departments connected with the Government—I say that the loyalty, which, in a time like this, would impeach every action of the Government, every action of its Executive and every action of the Congress, which has passed resolutions upon this subject and which has exhausted even the extremest patience in forbearing with this rebellion—I say that that loyalty which impeaches all actions of that kind and throws every possible obstruction in the way of the Government, appears to me a strange kind of loyalty. What would you think of the man who would go from the Senate of Pennsylvania to the army, when it was in battle array against the enemy, when the forces on either side were drawn up and the contest was about to commence, which would decide the fate of the entire rebellion and of the country, when host was battled against host, when the nerve of every soldier in the Union army was strung to the highest pitch of patriotism, and inspired by devotion to his country, he was thinking that the next day might bring victory and peace—what would you think of the man who would come fresh from the halls of the Senate of Pennsylvania and tell that soldier and that army, at such a crises, “Your commander-in-chief is violating law; he is a traitor like the rebels themselves; you should not fight under any such leader?” What would you think of the man who would tell that army, at such a time, that their commander-in-chief was a usurper of authority, or tell them that the men appointed by the President to military commissions were usurpers, and ought not to be heard in legislative halls in defence of the Government? Let that speech ring along the line of our troops as they face the enemy in battle array. Is it calculated to nerve and cheer the soldier in his defence of the country? Is that the kind of a speech that would be likely to send an electric thrill of fierce determination through every man who holds a musket or wields a sword in behalf of our rights? I tell you that

a speech of that kind would go along the ranks of the rebels and be greeted with a cheer from every rank and every company; and it ought to be, because its tendency and effect is to encourage rebellion and give aid and comfort to treason. You cannot tell a man who is engaged in the service, no matter under what commander he may be, that his commander is usurping and violating the law, that he has no authority for what he is doing and that he is violating the first principles of the Constitution of the country, which he is sworn to support—you cannot tell any man that and inspire him with any courage. Away, then, with all this talk of still being loyal to the Government, while you are discouraging it every step it takes in this unexampled war. It is mere sophistry to attempt to make a distinction between the Administration as it is and the Government as it is. They are one. If you say that the Administration must be put down, as the Senator on my left [Mr. BOUND] has well said, then you assert a principle of revolution, for the Government must be changed when you change the Administration in any other than a constitutional way. The present Administration of the Government I undertake to say, (and I will not go into detail,) has forbore perhaps too much in enforcing the laws and the Constitution upon the rebels now in arms. If they had succumbed less in the beginning to this outcry of a violation of the Constitution and laws, the rebellion would now have been much nearer being put down. What is in the Constitution? It cannot be contended for a moment that men understanding the forms of government, much less the almost inspired men who framed the Constitution under which we live, framed any form of government or any constitution that had not within itself the means of self-defence. What do you mean by giving executive power to the President, by making him Commander-in-Chief of your armies, if he has not the power to carry out the policy he may adopt in managing the affairs of the country, for which duty he is responsible. Tie up his hands; fetter him if you please; but then do not come here and complain that he has done nothing. When he has done everything a true patriot could do and has gone to the farthest verge of forbearance, and when at the very last extremity, when the Government, the country and our institutions are imperilled; when everything may be lost; and at the very last moment he resorts to what he considers and what I presume the patriots of the country everywhere consider a measure of necessity, which ought to have been adopted before—when he resorts to that as the last arm of strength that is to nerve him in this contest—he should be sustained. Why, Mr. Speaker, if you abandon him there, you abandon the Government; and I for one desire to say that I would as soon see a revolution inaugurated

at once as to presume that we were for one moment to encourage the idea that we should resist the Administration under the pretence of supporting the Government. It is false in theory; it is false in argument and cannot be sustained. The Government must wield all its energies or it must go down. If a slight infraction of the Constitution is to be made, then I say rather let the letter of the written instrument be partially violated, than that while the armies are in the field and the rebellion is grappling at the throat of our sons and fathers, the whole fabric should go down in a common ruin. And that must be the result if the measures advocated on the other side of the chamber are to govern the State, for the State Government would thereby inevitably come into collision with the General Government.

If the executive power of the nation, because it does not apply in every respect to the strict rule of the civil law, is to be superseded, then we must submit to revolution and the institutions of the country cannot and never will be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I have done. The condition of the country at this hour is a fearful one. At one time, as the Senator said, there was but one sentiment here and but one sentiment throughout the North. When the first gun sounded the token of rebellion, each heart beat in unison to the same sentiments and each arm was nerved for the same contest. The abstractions of party ambition have interfered with that unity. We must go back. I call upon the Democracy and the Senator's friends on the other side of the chamber to go back to that point. Call upon us to go back to the Constitution! We never departed from it. Talk about your arbitrary arrests. Was there ever an arrest made of any man not fairly suspected of disloyalty to the Government—of a man not found in the disloyal ranks? Has there been found a man advocating the principles of the party by whose votes we, on this side of the chamber, have been elected, who could justly be charged as being touched with a single taint of disloyalty? There is the point. You find—as the Senator on my left (Mr. BOUND) has well remarked—you find the ranks of the rebellion crowded with the party friends of the gentlemen who talk of their loyalty. I do not reproach Senators with that fact; they are not, perhaps, responsible for their party friends. But it is a singular fact that wherever the taint of disloyalty is found, you find it among the professors of that political heresy which places the rights of a State above the rights of the National Government. We must go back then, I say, to the unity of sentiment that existed at the commencement of the rebellion, and we cannot go back to it upon any other principle than the support of the Government and the power which is re-

sponsible for its exercise. If you give encouragement to the Government, you give it power, hope and comfort. We must go back to the one point where we profess to stand; and no matter by what party names it is called, we must go back to the one single point: unity in favor of supporting the Government and in voting it supplies, lending it our arm and strength; else the Government must fall. Divide us upon any question, political or otherwise, and the rebellion cannot be suppressed. The Senator tells us they will unite the sword with the olive branch of peace. I tell him when you come with the olive branch of peace with treason, we will give you the hempen cord and the gallows for all traitors, North and South. When you take the sword, we say, "as the Lord liveth you and your rebel allies shall perish by the sword, for we have sworn that this accursed rebellion, with all its abettors, must and shall be conquered, and the authority of the Government established and maintained in spite of the hypocritical cry and treasonable menace of party leaders who seek to destroy it. And when that is done, the people will look with pity and contempt upon the miserable tricksters who attempted to deceive and mislead them here, as they sink into their merited oblivion.

The question before the Senate being on the amendment of Mr. RIDGWAY to the amendment of Mr. LAMBERTON, as follows: to insert in lieu of the amendment the following:

"And that when Major-General George B. McClellan, or any other friend of the Union, desires the use of this hall for the purpose of defending the cause of the Union and denouncing the rebellion, it will be cheerfully tendered.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. CLYMER and Mr. STEIN, and were as follow, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lowry, M'Candless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, *Speaker*—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Bucher, Clymer, Donovan, Glatz, Lamberton, Mott, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—10.

So the amendment of Mr. RIDGWAY was agreed to.

The question recurring on the amendment as amended, it was read, as follows:

"And that when Major-General George B. McClellan or any other friend of the Union, desires the use of the hall for the purpose of defending the cause of the Union and denouncing the rebellion, it shall be cheerfully tendered."

Mr. LAMBERTON offered the following amendment:—to add to the end of the amendment as amended the following:

"And it is hereby tendered to the said General George B. McClellan, and we cordially invite him to visit the capitol of his native State."

Mr. CONNELL. I suggest that the words "for that purpose," be added to the amendment just offered.

On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. LAMBERTON to the amendment as amended.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. LAMBERTON and Mr. CLYMER, and were as follow, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Bucher, Clymer, Donovan, Glatz, Kinsley, Lamberton, Mott, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—11.

NAYS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Lowry, M'Candless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, *Speaker*—19.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The question again recurring on the amendment as amended.

Mr. LOWRY. I desire to know whether it is in order to move to amend at this time by inserting the names of John C. Fremont and Benjamin F. Butler.

The SPEAKER. An amendment to that effect would be in order.

Mr. DONOVAN. I move to insert the names of Horace Greeley and Wendell Phillips.

Mr. LOWRY. I would say to the Senator from Philadelphia that a Democratic House of Representatives one year since, by their solemn vote, gave Cheever an opportunity to speak in their hall, and to-day they have denied a similar opportunity to Andrew Johnson.

Mr. LAMBERTON. I would like to ask the Senator from Erie a question. Does he mean to call the House of Representatives of last year a Democratic House?

Mr. LOWRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAMBERTON. It is the first information I have had of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Erie.

Mr. CLYMER. On that I call the yeas and nays.

Mr. LOWRY. At the request, Mr. Speaker,

of a Democratic Senator I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a Republican member, I withdraw my amendment.

The question being on the amendment as amended.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. STEIN and Mr. DONOVAN and were as follow, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Bucher, Connoll, Fuller, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lowry M'Candless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrell, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, *Speaker*—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Clymer, Donovan, Glatz, Lamberton, Mott, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—9.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LOWRY. Inasmuch as the name of Andrew Johnson is coupled with that of George B. McClellan, and as we cannot hear Andrew Johnson without giving this kind of compliment, which was thrown out as a tub to the whale of Democracy, I vote "aye."

The result of the vote was then announced as above.

The question being on the resolution as amended.

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. CLYMER and Mr. Hiestand, and were as follow, viz:

YEAS—Messrs. Boughter, Bound, Connell, Fuller, Hamilton, Hiestand, Johnson, Kinsey, Lowry, M'Candless, Nichols, Penney, Ridgway, Robinson, Serrill, Stutzman, Turrell, White, Wilson and Lawrence, *Speaker*—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Bucher, Clymer, Donovan, Glatz, Lamberton, Mott, Smith, Stark, Stein and Wallace—10.

So the resolution as amended was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The chair is requested to state that arrangements have been made by which the distinguished gentlemen, ex-Governors Johnson and Wright, will address the people of Harrisburg in the Court House, at seven o'clock this evening.

The Senate

Adjourned.